

BX-

1257

V4x

J. L. Lorrain

for title-page see p. [7]



REVEREND AND DEAR FATHER:

An apology is never needed for a heart-to-heart talk between the Directors of the Apostleship of Prayer; but at the present juncture the omission of such a more intimate conversation would amount to a positive fault. It is not merely that we are approaching the time best suited for the choice of Promoters and the renewal of fervor in the body of the members; nor do I refer merely to the nearness of the joyful season when the human heart is wont to show itself to its best advantage; but I write under the influence of events that bear an important relation to the welfare of the whole Apostleship of Prayer, and in particular of the portion which is found within the territory of the United States. On April 18 died the Director-General of the Apostleship of Prayer, Father Luis Martin, the Father-General of the Society of Jesus; he has been succeeded by Father Francis Wernz, whose election to the generalship of the Society of Jesus occurred on the Feast of the Nativity of our Blessed Lady, September 8. Besides, the Central Director of the Apostleship existing in the boundaries of the United States has been called to another field of usefulness, so that our American portion of the Association labors under the disadvantage of a double change.

It would be an impardonable ingratitude on our part, were we to pass over the memory of our late Director-General and our former Central Director, without recalling the important services they have rendered to the League of the Sacred Heart. The name of our former Central Director has been identified with the work of the League for the past fifteen years, while Father Luis Martin was Father-General of the

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY  
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

Society of Jesus since the autumn of 1892. During the period of their administration His Holiness Pope Leo XIII. proclaimed the new Constitution of the Apostleship of Prayer, which gave the Association a canonically legal standing in the Church; during the same period the Diocesan Directors were first appointed, the number of members began to outgrow all previous record, and the Apostleship flourished as it had never done before. We know that all good gifts come from above, and that our present flourishing condition is due to the love of the Sacred Heart and the grace of the Holy Ghost rather than to any human instrument. At the same time, God's grace and love do not work among men without the instrumentality of human aid; and it is in this sense that we here publicly acknowledge the services of our late efficient leaders, and tender them at the same time the expression of our sincerest gratitude.

And in order that this manifestation of our feelings may not remain an idle expression of sentiment, we must show by our conduct that we appreciate the worth of those men whom it has been our privilege to have for so long a period for our Directors. If there is any quality for which both were noted, it is their untiring activity, their live interest in their charge. They thoroughly realized that the Apostleship of Prayer is a mighty lever for good; but they realized that it is only a lever, that it is not a sacrament which works *ex opere operato*, as theologians would say. The Apostleship is a powerful spiritual engine; but even the most perfect of engines does not work without a supply of power. What does one get out of an engine? Precisely what one puts into it. The engine economizes the power, and applies it to the best advantage in order to obtain certain definite results. Even so it is in the case of the Apostleship of Prayer.

Our late Directors were not content with merely holding the Diplomas of their respective Directorships; they did not lay their hands in their laps, merely watching, as it were, the incense of prayer ascending from the Apostleship day after

day to the Mercy Seat of God, and the rain of natural and supernatural blessings pouring in answer to these prayers upon our suffering and sin-laden world. Not as if such a sight were not most edifying and helpful; it is good and useful in its own time, but as a general rule the machine must be watched, and the supply of power must be kept in view.

It is true that the machinery of our Association is most simple: the Director-General, the Diocesan Directors, the Local Directors, and the Promoters constitute practically our entire official *personel*. But this simplicity does not do away with the need of active interest on the part of each officer. Even the old pagan philosopher reduced all movement to the prime mover; the nature of things has not changed since his time, so that in our days, too, all movement is in proportion to the activity of the prime mover. Thanks be to God for the amount of consoling news which our mail man brings us almost daily; but we thank the Directors too for the zeal they display. Of the 11,584 churches and 2,206 pious Institutions in the United States, 5,144 churches and 1,541 pious Institutions are now aggregated to the Apostleship of Prayer. There are, therefore, in all, 6,685 Local Centers in the United States. In order to show that the League is not at a stand-still, we may mention that of these 6,685 Local Centers, 948 have been aggregated since January, 1902; of these new aggregations, 800 were churches, and 146 pious Institutions. And the spread of Promoters has kept an even pace with the erection of new Centers. During the past five years 28,331 Promoters received their Cross and Diploma. The present status of the Apostleship becomes more satisfactory still, if we consider that of the 11,814 churches, 3,941 are missionary posts with no resident priest; many of these belong to the Local Centers of those churches from which they are attended.

But consoling as these figures may be, they are not such as to warrant the Directors to rest satisfied with our present condition. If the Diocesan Directors look over the list of Local Centers situated in their respective dioceses, they will



notice that many parishes within the sphere of their Directorship are not as yet aggregated to our Association. In the same way, the Local Directors need only consult their Registers in order to become convinced that a great number of parishioners are not as yet members of the Apostleship of Prayer. The Directors are well acquainted with the staple exception that the other pious Associations must be allowed to exist, that the parishes or parishioners not aggregated to the Apostleship belong to sodalities and other religious societies. Need we repeat the assurance that the League does not interfere with any other pious union? It does not impose any obligation at variance with the requirements of any sodality or society. At the same time, it infuses into all its members a spirit that will make better sodalists, better parishioners, better Catholics.

Not as if we expected the Directors to exercise their energy in directions foreign to their position. The Diocesan Directors are supposed to assist the priests in their respective dioceses to organize or reorganize the League, by directing them personally or by letters, by preaching, or by forming Centers for them. If their other duties should ever interfere with these obligations, we shall be only too glad to perform this service for them, either by corresponding with Local Directors, or, so far as time and distance permit, by preaching, or organizing Centers. The Diocesan Director will fail in his duty if he is not able and ready to give every applicant for aggregation the benefit of his own example and experience in managing a well organized Center, to make suggestions for improving the work, to solve difficulties, satisfy complaints, and clear up misunderstandings. Your zeal will suggest to you the proper occasions on which your work may be done most advantageously: when you meet your fellow-priests in Conference, Retreat, or Synod, when pastors are changed, or new parishes are erected. Any help or direction you need in the performance of these various duties, we shall be only too happy to give.

The Local Directors, too, have their own peculiar sphere of duties: they must recommend and explain the General Intention every month, they must keep the Register of Aggregation faithfully, distribute the members among the bands of Promoters most advantageously, regulate the monthly communions, supervise the distribution of Leaflets, select and train Promoters, and above all hold the monthly Promoters' meetings. In their dealing with Promoters, they ought to proceed without any respect for person; Promoters should be chosen from every class of society, from among men as well as women; they should be advanced according to their degree of efficiency, and they ought to be replaced as soon as they show themselves inefficient in the discharge of their various duties. The Local Director must urge the various practices of the Apostleship, the Morning Offering, the daily Decade of Hail Marys, the Communion of Reparation, and the Holy Hour; he must be exacting in his members' attention to the Treasury of Good Works, to the reading of the Leaflets and of the *Messenger of the Sacred Heart*. If the Local Director is attentive to his duties, the First Friday will be a *red letter* day in the life of the parish, not merely in its female but also in its male contingent.

We have compared the Apostleship of Prayer to an engine: the Directors are the engineers; but whence comes the power? The power is the love of the Sacred Heart. Our Association is the Apostleship of Prayer *in League* with the Sacred Heart. It is with a view of increasing this power that I forward with this letter a Theological Study of the Devotion to the Sacred Heart. The author, who is one of Europe's foremost Canonists, clearly distinguishes between what is certain and what is merely probable in his treatise; the reader may disagree with the writer on controverted points, but he cannot afford to neglect this pamphlet. On our part, we present it to the Diocesan and Local Directors for the love of the Sacred Heart; let the Directors for the love of that same Heart sacrifice enough of their time to read and study it. If they are faithful

to their part of this compact, both Directors and members of the Apostleship of Prayer in the United States will be animated with a new degree of love for the Sacred Heart, a gift more precious than any "Merry Christmas" or "Happy New Year" wishes they may receive from their earthly friends.

In union with your prayers and holy sacrifices,

Yours sincerely in Christ,

A. J. MAAS, S.J.

Central Office of the Apostleship of Prayer,

27-29 West 16th Street, New York.

*On the Feast of Blessed Margaret Mary.*

[5]

# The Proper Object

of the

## Devotion to the Sacred Heart

---

A THEOLOGICAL STUDY

---

By the  
*Arthur*  
Rev. A. Vermeersch, S.J.

---

Translation and Reprint of Two Articles Published in the Etudes  
for January 20 and February 20, 1906

With a Letter of the Central Director to all Diocesan and Local Directors



APOSTLESHIP OF PRAYER,  
27-29 W. 16th St., New York.

BY  
1257  
V4X

Respectfully Dedicated  
to the  
Diocesan and Local Directors of the Apostleship of Prayer  
in the  
United States of North America.

196108



## CONTENTS.

Letter of Central Director.....	1
INTRODUCTION .....	11
CHAPTER I. Preliminary Ideas: General View of Devotions, Sources to be consulted.....	13
CHAPTER II. The Proper and Direct Object of the Worship: the Human, Living Heart of Our Lord Jesus Christ .....	16
CHAPTER III. The Living Heart of the Redeemer Considered in Connection with Love.....	18
CHAPTER IV. The Proper Object of the Devotion to the Sacred Heart is the Heart of Christ as a Real Symbol of His Love.....	20
(1) What is a Symbol?.....	21
(2) The Heart is a Symbol of Human Affections..	22
(3) The Heart of Christ is Taken as a Symbol....	23
(4) Important Corollary: the Material and Formal Object of the Devotion.....	24
CHAPTER V. The Love of Which the Heart of Jesus is the Symbol .....	27
(1) The Mystery of the Incarnation. Created and Uncreated Love. The Question Considered from This Point of View.....	28
(2) Authors' Opinions .....	30
Preliminary Observations .....	30
Father de La Colmbière, S.J.....	32
Father Croiset, S.J.....	32
Father Froment, S.J.....	33
Father de Gallifet, S.J.....	34
Cardinal Gerdil .....	35
Benoit Tetamo, S.J.....	35
Emmanuel Marquès .....	35
François-Antoine Zaccaria, S.J.....	36
Muzzarelli .....	37
Father Roothaan, S.J.....	37

Father Gautrelet, S.J.....	38
Cardinal Franzelin, S.J.....	38
Fathers de San and Nilles, S.J.....	38
Canon Leroy .....	39
Father Bucceroni, S.J.....	39
Father Bernard Dalgairns.....	39
Father Chevalier .....	39
Father Billot, S.J.....	39
Fathers A. Martorell and Joseph Castella, S.J...	40
Father J. B. Terrien, S.J.....	40
Abbé Baruteil .....	41
Father Thill .....	41
(3) Decree of the Holy See: Memorial of Polish Bishops, Clement XIII, Pius VI, Pius VII, Pius IX, Fathers of the Vatican Council, Congrega- tion of Rites, Pauline Epistles.....	42
(4) A Theological Examination of the Question:	48
A. In What Sense Uncreated Love is Necessarily Understood in the Devotion to the Sacred Heart .....	49
B. The Value and Dignity of Christ's Created Love .....	50
C. Why the Special Reason for the Devotion to the Sacred Heart is Furnished by Created, Not Uncreated, Love .....	52
D. How in a Broad Sense Uncreated Love May Become the Special Object of the Devotion to the Sacred Heart.....	56
E. Conclusions and Corollaries.....	59
CHAPTER VI. Devotion to the Blessed Sacrament Com- pared with the Devotion to the Sacred Heart.....	63
CHAPTER VII. Devotion to the Holy Ghost Compared with the Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus....	65
APPENDIX. 1. Devotion to the Eucharistic Heart of Jesus.	
2. The Practice of the Devotion to the Heart of Jesus.	
3. Acts of Devotion.....	67

# THE PROPER OBJECT OF THE DEVOTION TO THE SACRED HEART.

A THEOLOGICAL STUDY.(1)

## INTRODUCTION.

ALTHOUGH devotions which are already prosperous thrive on reinforcement of light and heat, there is nevertheless a certain exuberance of life that is prejudicial to them. Too many minds have but an inadequate knowledge of them and this, coupled with a desire for novelty or originality, is seriously apt to engender mistakes and errors. Side by side with elaborations which are really precious for the defense or clear understanding of a form or practice of worship, are those which so distort the object of that worship as to misdirect both thought and homage. An indiscreet zeal will so dilate upon the special value of a devotion as to lessen rather than increase its influence and utility, and it is above all after the

---

(1) This article is intended to refute a specious and seductive opinion now gaining ground and in which we cannot fail to see unfortunate blunders and confusion. The relative favor which it enjoys would seem to us due to an inadequate understanding of the subject, and we have thought to further the interests of the true devotion to the Sacred Heart by awakening serious reflection on a question which we know is already receiving great attention in Germany and Austria. The hearty welcome heretofore accorded our article on *The Great Promise* by the readers of *Etudes* has naturally inspired us to dedicate this new work to them.

triumph of a cause, when we withdraw our attention from a tedious opposition at length reduced to silence, that curiosity and a fear of the commonplace threaten to mislead us. "I will not speak to you of the Sacred Heart," wrote Mgr. d'Hulst, May 31, 1883.(1) "It has already been too deeply wronged by over-ardent enthusiasts. Our Lord Himself must tell you of It; we speak of It too unworthily."

These words are most significant: they justify our first pages wherein we propose to write *simply* of the object of the devotion that we may write of it well. A *first section* will contain some preliminary remarks, and the *three following* will succinctly set forth ideas supported by a concise demonstration, and so generally accepted as to be considered definitely established. Hence, by passing through these successive stages we will come into possession of the light prepared by preceding works for friends of the devotion to the Sacred Heart. All honor to our illustrious predecessors!

Now, however important these generally accepted ideas, they do not furnish a definition of the object in all its bearings and, as we shall see, at least one of these remains obscure. Although we do not deem the solution of the question difficult, it is certainly worthy of any effort entailed, since it deals with the mystery of the Incarnation of the Word, a mystery so dear to our hearts; it influences preaching and, in itself a sufficient advantage, states most accurately the object of the great devotion of our time, the devotion to the Sacred Heart. Impelled by a desire to elucidate this question, we shall endeavor to do so in a *fifth section*.

The last two sections may be called complementary; we shall compare the devotion to the Sacred Heart with the devotion to the Blessed Sacrament and the worship of the Holy Ghost in order, by this comparison, to throw into as strong a light as possible the complete and exact object of the homage which we pay to the Heart of our Saviour, Jesus Christ.

---

(1) *Letters of Direction*, p. 74.



In the Appendix we shall say a few words on devotion to the *Eucharistic Heart* of Jesus, and dwell briefly on the *practice* of devotion to the Sacred Heart as it has been taught us by two of its greatest promoters and exponents, Fathers Croiset and de Gallifet.

In discussing the question which, above all, has captivated our interest, it is impossible to avoid partial disagreement with writers for whom we otherwise profess the greatest esteem; but surely they should be neither astonished nor offended by a contradiction, prompted as they are by such a desire as actuates them, to extend the true reign of the Heart of Jesus. However, though indicating in perfectly good faith, the errors or inaccuracies of others, we ourselves are laying no claim to infallibility. Prior to writing we joined much reading to our personal reflections, and submitted our ideas to several judges especially well versed in theological science. Encouraged by their approbation, we offer our conclusions to the public, though not without the sincere assurance of our willingness to surrender to stronger arguments.

## CHAPTER I.

### PRELIMINARY IDEAS.

*General View of Devotions.*—When considering that which prompts honor and homage, and to what they are directed, we should distinguish between the *person* who receives, the *excellence* which justifies, and the *manifestation* which occasions them.

Homage is always received by a person and proportioned to his dignity.(1)

Some special quality of such a person, more frequently than his entire personality, entitles him to homage, and is the excellence prompting it, or, to speak philosophically, constitutes its *formal object*.

This quality is gathered by its manifestations: if it does not

---

(1) Saint Thomas's *Summa theol.*, part III, p. XXV, a. 1.

flash out from some part of the person it is demonstrated by acts and works.

Thus, even in the human order, we accord a king the royal honor due to his character, while at the same time we admire the masculine beauty of his features, and do homage to his intellectual abilities as shown by the wisdom of his administration, and the goodness of his heart as manifested by his benefactions.

We might say indifferently that we specially honor the king because of his beauty, his intellect or his heart, or that we admire his beauty, praise his intelligence and extol his goodness.

Applied to the worship of the Sacred Heart, these simple reflections show us that, by this worship, we honor the Person of Our Lord Jesus Christ; that it is the supreme worship due to God alone, as Jesus Christ is God<sup>(1)</sup> adorable in all that is united to His Person, particularly in His Heart; and that it is a special worship inasmuch as it is prompted by a quality which the heart possesses or represents.

The Person of Our Lord Jesus Christ, its excellences, all of which are infinite in dignity, are the common object, the general reason of all the feasts and of all the devotions by which Our Lord is glorified. In order to become acquainted with the proper object or the special justification of the devotion to the Sacred Heart and of the corresponding feast, it is necessary to understand *what is meant by the Heart of Our Lord Jesus Christ, under what aspect* it is considered, and *what quality attracts our homage*. It is, therefore, around these points that the interest of our study centers.

*Sources to be consulted.* In all questions of worship the science of revelation should be carefully consulted. All interpretations which contradict its indubitable teachings are false, and such as do not tally with its principles and traditions on the economy of our salvation are questionable; whilst a favorable prejudgment militates for a theory that harmonizes

---

(1) Later on we shall explain in fuller detail how Jesus Christ is adorable even in His humanity.

with the general principles of theology. Besides this rather negative mission, theology has another, that of showing in the deposit of faith the indispensable foundation of every solid devotion.

Great devotions have their genesis, their history. Most frequently their beginnings are connected with some extraordinary providential event and with an initiative which at first suffers opposition, then triumphs, and, after a series of tests, at length wins the approbation and later the encouragement of ecclesiastical authority. The opinion of those who promoted it, and above all those decrees of the Holy See which confirm or correct it, will furnish the principal elements of positive explanation.

The study and discussion of these elements lead to a more distinct and adequate understanding of the object and nature of the worship.

By way of résumé the following formula might be proposed: A knowledge of "*the proper object of the devotion to the Sacred Heart springs chiefly from the theological examination of data furnished by the origin of the devotion and the decisions of the Holy See.*"

In corroboration of these statements we quote two testimonies.

The worship of the Sacred Heart is no longer a private one but has become public, and in all churches the feast of the Sacred Heart is celebrated. "Therefore," says Father Nilles(1) "the decrees and public acts of the Holy See should be referred to, and the classic authors who have treated the question be consulted." And Father de Gallifet, the principal private authority to be invoked, says:(2) "Since the devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus had its origin in a heavenly revelation, in this revelation must be sought the object of worship, and the manner in which the devotion should be practiced."

---

(1) *De Rationibus festorum SS. Cordis Iesu*, etc., 1. p. 328.

(2) *De Cultu Sacrosancti Cordis*, etc., book I, chap. IV.



## CHAPTER II.

THE PROPER AND DIRECT OBJECT OF WORSHIP: THE HUMAN,  
LIVING HEART OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.

The *object* of the devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus is, first of all, *the real, living Heart that beats in the bosom of Our Saviour, that forms a part of His humanity and was pierced on the cross.* In His great apparitions to Blessed Margaret Mary, Our Lord discloses this real, living heart, and when the heart is separately represented the wound inflicted on the cross figures prominently. For a conclusive proof a line taken from the account of the most solemn manifestation with which the Blessed one was favored should suffice: "And showing me His Heart, He said: 'Behold the Heart which has loved men so much.'"(1)

A peremptory argument is likewise furnished by the apostolic constitution *Auctorem fidei*, of August 28, 1794. In condemning the 63rd proposition of the Jansenistic Synod of Pistoja, Pius VI clearly acknowledges in this constitution that the faithful adore the Heart of Jesus, that is to say, the Heart of the Person of the Word, the Heart indissolubly united to this Person in the same way in which, after death, His Body, inseparable from His Divinity and without making abstraction of it, was adorable in the tomb.(2)

The last words of Pius VI are sufficiently clear: the heart is not isolated and, as it were, extracted from the Body; we honor a Heart intimately united to the Soul of Jesus and to His Divine Person, "the Heart which, with the Soul of Jesus and His Divine Person, constitutes a single object of adoration. . . . This object," continues Father de Gallifet, "is formed of the Heart of Jesus, the Soul of Jesus, and the Person of the Son of God, by joining thereunto all the graces,

(1) Life and Works of Blessed Margaret Mary Alacoque, vol. II, pp. 270, 327, 355.

(2) "Illud adorant ut est cor Jesu, cor nempe personæ Verbi, cui inseparabiliter unitum est, ad eum modum quo exsanguie corpus Christi, in triduo mortis, sine separatione aut præcisione a divinitate, adorabile fuit in sepulcro."



all the treasures of heavenly gifts, all the virtues and all the affections peculiar to that Heart.”(1)

This point is therefore well established. In our devotion the word *heart* is not a metaphorical term used to convey the idea of love, and if, as we shall see, this idea dominates, it cannot therefore be said that the worship is improperly called that of the Sacred Heart and is in reality the devotion of the love of Christ irrespective of the Heart of Flesh which represents that love. Such was the view held by Catholics hostile to the devotion, when the decree of approbation appeared in 1765.(2) According to this document the worship of the Sacred Heart consisted in symbolically renewing our love of the Son of God, etc. Mistaking the value of the term “*symbolic renewal*,” a certain Blasius, together with others of the same school, maintained that, in the decree, there was no question of honoring a heart of flesh but a purely symbolic heart, or, to be more accurate,(3) a heart in the general sense, taken metaphorically for the affections.(4) But besides the fact that “the symbolic renewal” supposes a real symbol, viz., the living Heart of Christ, it suffices to refute this system to recall that the decrees approved the devotion such as it had been represented by the bishops of Poland in their petition wherein they stated that they understood the word heart *in its proper sense* and not metaphorically.(5) And in regard to this Zaccaria declared: “The feast of a purely symbolic heart will never be, either properly or improperly, a feast of the Sacred Heart of Jesus.”(6)

Devotion to the Sacred Heart honors the real Heart of Jesus; in section 3rd we shall see under what aspect.

(1) *De Cultu* . . . , book I, chap. IV. Benedict XIV mentions this idea as that of the promoters of the devotion. (*De Beatificatione*, book IV, chap. XXXI, n. 21.)

(2) The decree will be quoted later on among the documents of the Holy See.

(3) A symbolic heart may be a very real heart. See section IV.

(4) See, for example, Franzelin's *De Verbo incarnato* 3, pp. 470, 471.

(5) *Cor Jesu, non tralatitè sumptum, sed in propria ac nativa significatione, videlicet ut est pars corporis Christi nobilissima.*

(6) Fr. Ant. Zaccaria, *Antidoto contra i libri di Blasi* . . . lett. VI, p. 61.

## CHAPTER III.

## THE LIVING HEART OF THE REDEEMER CONSIDERED IN CONNECTION WITH LOVE.

To ask how the Divine Heart of Jesus is regarded in the practice of the devotion is to inquire into the quality which makes the heart the proper object of this devotion, viz., to seek the formal element of this object and the special aspect under which it is considered; just as upon investigating we find that color is the formal object of sight and sound the formal object of hearing, because the eye perceives an object inasmuch as it is colored and the ear detects it inasmuch as it is sonorous.

The living Heart is a part of Our Lord's Body, and, as such, it is adorable. But it is not therefore chosen as the object of a special devotion. If it were, why should not all other parts of Christ's Body, though lacking sentiment, knowledge and affection, just as well be glorified, and, as was objected by the Promoter of the Faith, there would then be as many feasts as the body has parts or members. But of course such a view was never seriously entertained.(1)

Now, the heart is chosen because it is *overflowing with love for men and wounded by their ingratitude*. Thus we find in the revelations of Blessed Margaret Mary: "Behold the Heart which has loved men so much. . . . Instead of gratitude, I receive from the greater part (of mankind) only ingratitude"; and Father de Gallifet tells us(2) that there is a like expression in the *Memorial* offered to the Congregation of Rites under Benedict XIII.(3)

1. We say *overflowing with love*, not that the heart must necessarily be considered the seat of sensible affections—the Sacred Congregation wishing to avoid a philosophical controversy opposed at the very outset by the Promoter of the

---

(1) Defenders' reply to the objections of the Promoter of the Faith. (Nilles, *De Rationibus*. . . . V, n. 17, p. 145.)

(2) *De Cultu* . . . , book I, chap. IV.

(3) *Cor quatenus amore hominum ardentissimum, pro peccatis afflictissimum*.

Faith, the future Pope, Benedict XIV(1)—but because there is an intimate, undeniable correspondence between the movements of the heart and our affections, sensible as well as spiritual, nay, even supernatural, since the heart feels the impressions of our affections.(2)

Moreover, the wound that opened this Heart betokened an extreme love, a love which was ready to sacrifice even life itself, and the same thought is expressed when it is said that the heart is taken as an object inasmuch as it is the *universally accepted symbol of the love* of Christ. However, this borders upon matter to be discussed in the following section, and we must not anticipate.

2. The Heart, as we have said, is considered as wounded by our ingratitude. This point is demonstrated by the words of the revelation already quoted: "Instead of gratitude, I receive from the greater part (of mankind) only ingratitude. . . . But what is still more painful to Me is that they are hearts consecrated to Me." At any rate, this is admitted without dispute. Father de Gallifet says (*op. cit.*, Book I, chap. IV): "For the perfect understanding of this worship it is not enough to consider the Heart of Jesus as united to His Divinity and overflowing with love for men and, for this twofold reason, worthy of our adoration and love; we must likewise consider the cruel insults which It suffered from the ingratitude of men, the atrocious injuries heaped upon It and that It therefore merits not only our love but also, if we may be permitted so to speak, our sympathy and compassion."

Our Saviour suffered grievously in His mortal life,(3) and especially on the night of His agony in the Garden of Olives when He was in the agony of His Passion because experiencing the passion of His Heart.(4)

(1) *De Beatificatione*, book IV, chap. XXXI, n. 25.

(2) Nilles, *De Rationibus* . . . . edit. 5, p. 332 note.

(3) *Olim*, "of old," says Father de Gallifet, *De Cultu* . . . . , book I, chap. IV.

(4) "This mystery of the agony is a holy of holies. It is the heart of the passion of Christ, because it is the passion of His Heart." (Mgr. Gay in *Meditations on the Mysteries of the Rosary*.)



Without debarring other conclusive proofs of the love of Christ, we maintain that the devotion to the Sacred Heart is connected chiefly with these two: the *sufferings of the Passion* and the *institution of the Holy Eucharist*. According to Blessed Margaret Mary, scarcely had Our Lord represented His Heart as exhausting Itself in conquering men by Its tenderness, than He complained of the insults of which He is the object in the sacrament of His love. "The particular object of this devotion," says Father Croiset,(1) "is the immense love of the Son of God, which has led Him to deliver Himself up to death for us and to give Himself entirely to us in the most holy Sacrament of the Altar." "The Heart of Jesus," adds Father de San,(2) "is, in a strict sense, the symbol of the created love of Christ for us, above all of the love which He manifests for us in His passion and in the Eucharist." The love that we honor and that is referred to in the sixth lesson of the Breviary is the love of Our suffering Saviour, Who instituted the sacrament of His Body and Blood in memory of His death.

*Conclusion.* Father de Gallifet's definition is therefore justified: *The worship of the Sacred Heart honors the Divine Heart of Jesus as burning with love for men and at the same time deeply wounded (in the past) because of the insults with which, in their ungrateful impiety, these men overwhelm It.*(3)

#### CHAPTER IV.

##### THE PROPER OBJECT OF THE DEVOTION TO THE SACRED HEART IS THE HEART OF CHRIST, AS A REAL SYMBOL OF HIS LOVE.

All these questions are interlinked. We have asked ourselves why this Heart is the object of a special devotion, and have found that it is because of the bonds uniting It to the love of Jesus Christ, and this answer suggests a complementary question: Why choose It because of these bonds?

(1) *La Dévotion au Sacré Cœur*, beginning of chap. I, part I.

(2) *De Verbo incarnato*, chap. XXI.

(3) *De Cultu* . . . , book III, chap. 3.



To this we would reply: Because these bonds make It the universally accepted symbol of love and, on that account, the best sensible representation of that love.

However, if we would pass successfully through the third stage leading to a clear, distinct knowledge of the object of the devotion to the Sacred Heart, we must explain symbolism.

1. A symbol is a sensible reality, taken to represent another reality, abstract or spiritual. We resort to concrete symbols in order to clothe in a material form better adapted to our faculties, spiritual things of which we have no exact conception.

This substitution of one reality for another is founded on analogy which often consists in resemblances real or figurative, as when we symbolize purity by a white lily; meekness by a lamb or a dove; the ardor of passion by a flame. These resemblances sometimes lie in the *real connection* between two objects, especially that uniting cause to effect: health, for instance, is symbolized by the flush which it brings to the cheek; intellect by the head, where, on account of the brain, we suppose it to be placed.(1)

Symbolism founded on real bonds is limited to the object which is in *effective correspondence* with the reality symbolized. While every lion may symbolize strength and every

---

(1) Although both are founded on resemblances and destined to satisfy our need of concrete representations, symbols and metaphors are separated by characteristic differences which must not be lost to view. A metaphor distorts the real meaning of a word; a symbol preserves it. The former hides the object usually signified—as, for instance, a lion, from which the qualification of strength is withdrawn for the sake of clothing another object, Achilles, for example. A symbol requires that the object itself represent, under its own colors, another object, farther removed, more abstract; in a metaphor the word causes the disappearance of a proximate reality, whereas in a symbol such a reality is conveyed by the word. Moreover, the symbol enables us to simplify, synthesize and unify. Thus, a simple flag represents the complex idea of country, fatherland. We cannot, therefore, approve what M. Baruteil wrote in his *Genèse du culte du Sacré Cœur*, p. 43). "What, then, is the symbolic heart?" It is nothing but the reunion of the real heart and the metaphorical heart. Now, in the same expression and the same use, the word is not at once adapted to the real and the figurative meaning. A symbol does not suppose a metaphor, was not created by it; rather the symbolical use of the heart has made the metaphor. The symbolic heart is the real heart in its real function of symbolizing love.

lamb meekness, only one's health is really symbolized by the flush on the cheek and only one's intellect represented by the head. Nevertheless, bright colors may serve as a symbol of health in general and the head as a symbol of intelligence; but as soon as we individualize the object we must also individualize this kind of symbols.

2. Hence it is easy to see how the heart, without in the least resembling love, without even being the seat of any affection, is nevertheless the *real and natural* symbol of the human affections.

On the one hand, although the heart be hidden in the bosom, hearts that we have seen enable us to conceive a clear image of the heart of someone; on the other hand, although we cannot (at least at the present time) (1) read in the heart the sentiments to which the rhythm of its movements corresponds, this correspondence causes us to attribute to it these sentiments themselves: we localize them in the heart; in it we seem to discern the principles of the affections; our imagination pictures it under that form; the heart becomes the real and natural symbol of love. Father Billot could therefore write: "The heart is the symbol of love because it is its organ," (2) an indisputable proposition if we take the term *organ* in its broad acceptation, supposing nothing but simple repercussions.

We employ this symbolism of the human form when we represent by it pure spirits, even the Divinity Itself; the heart of the fictitious body with which we endow them is the symbol of their love, and we speak of the Heart of God as we would of the heart of man. Only here, and this remark will be of weight in what follows, the reality of symbolism disappears with the reality of the body and the heart: it is as purely *imaginary* as the entire body to which it relates.

There is a *metaphor* connected with the symbolism of the heart, according to which the heart signifies the will inasmuch as the will loves; hence, it is important to distinguish carefully

(1) Some physiologists are still hopeful of reaching this point.

(2) *De Verbo incarnato*, th. 36, coroll., p. 332.

between the *symbolic* aspect peculiar to the *real heart* and the *metaphorical* use of the word heart.(1)

These explanations clearly set forth the trend and meaning of the proposition: In the devotion to the Sacred Heart, the heart is not taken in a metaphorical sense as we have shown in Section II, *but as the real and natural symbol of love*, and this brings us back to the proposition with which this section was opened, a proposition easily demonstrated.

3. The Heart of Christ is taken as a *symbol*. The Acts of the Holy See, beginning with the first decree of 1765, afford unvarying proof of it. They mention the *symbolic renewal of memory*, the *symbolic image of charity*. (See quotations farther on.)

It is taken as a *real symbol*. (a) It was His true living Heart that Our Lord showed to Blessed Margaret Mary, and it was of this Heart that He said: "Behold the Heart which has loved so much." Now, is not to love with a true, living heart, to produce affections or to feel their impressions?

(b) Father de Gallifet and the defenders of the cause appealed incessantly to the *effective* correspondence between the heart and the emotions. Later, Pius IX proclaimed that the worship of the Sacred Heart was that of a heart burning with love for mankind, of a heart which is the seat of Divine Love. (See quotations farther on.)

(c) If the devotion to the Sacred Heart be founded on a simple metaphor, there is no reason whatever for uniting one's self to the physical, living Heart of Our Lord. The enemies of the devotion understand this well, and we have refuted their claims above.

(d) This truth, already evident, springs from the difference which the Acts of the Holy See establish and maintain between the worship of the Sacred Heart and that of the Holy Face. While they formally acknowledge and approve the

---

(1) Some authors speak of a *symbolic* heart as one taken in a *figurative sense*. Such language we hold to be defective. A symbolic heart is any heart used as a symbol. Now, symbolism belongs above all to a real heart, but it could pass thence to an imaginary heart, although even the use of the word *heart* is not *metaphorical*.



homage rendered the living Heart of the Saviour, they disapprove the *special and direct homage paid to the Holy Face*.<sup>(1)</sup> They admit that we continue to venerate the antique picture of the mangled Face of the Saviour and copies of it, in order thereby to excite ourselves to a livelier and more effectual remembrance of Our Saviour's passion.<sup>(2)</sup> In the devotion to the Sacred Heart the *image* of the heart is not the symbol we honor; it merely represents the true, living Heart which Itself is the *real and natural symbol of love*, and therefore receives our homage; in devotion to the Holy Face, the picture does not induce us to honor the real Face of Our Saviour but His *passion*, symbolically expressed on canvas. While just in its application to the worship of the Holy Face, this idea would be false if applied to the worship of the Sacred Heart, being that held by Catholics tainted with Jansenism. After this example we can better understand what the purely symbolic heart was, which, according to them, entered into the devotion to the Heart of Jesus.

But these proofs are superfluous, and we can unhesitatingly formulate our new conclusion: the proper object of the devotion to the Sacred Heart is *the heart, the real symbol of Christ's love*; and, in this object, the formal element is the quality of *real symbol*. In other words, the heart is honored because and inasmuch as it is (*identically*) the real symbol of the love of Jesus Christ.

4. *Important Corollary.* The aspect under which we consider the heart recalls what we are emphatically told elsewhere

---

(1) Decree of the Holy Office, May 4-5, 1892. (*Acta Sanctæ Sedis*, 25, 749.)

(2) Some may perhaps wonder why the deep imprint of suffering on the mangled Face of the Saviour would not justify a special devotion to that Face, as the bond with love justifies a particular devotion to the Heart of Jesus. We note two differences. The adorable Face of Jesus is not altogether expressive of sorrow, and where were once the bleeding stigmata is now an effulgence of purest joy. Hence the real Face of the Saviour could not be a symbol of suffering and the suffering Face does not correspond to any present reality; it exists merely on the canvas on which it was painted, and therefore the devotion could only be to a picture. On the contrary, the Heart of Jesus always loved, was never anything but love, and continues in perfect harmony with a love that will never end.



in the revelations of Blessed Margaret Mary. We honor the Heart of Christ the better to honor His love, in order to be the more deeply moved by this sensible representation which the wound received on the cross helps to make more expressive. The honor paid to that love constitutes the proximate end of the devotion to the Sacred Heart; and if the real bond with the love of Christ explain and justify it, inasmuch as the heart is its point of termination, the love itself explains and justifies this same devotion inasmuch as the latter terminates in Jesus Christ, Who, as we said in the beginning, is its object or primary end.\* We especially honor Jesus Christ because He loves, and we honor His Heart because It is the symbol of His love. Thus, if we would return to the primary end, love constitutes the formal object of devotion to the Sacred Heart, and it was this what Pius VI meant when he said: "Devotion to the Sacred Heart substantially consists in meditating upon and in venerating in the symbolic image of the heart, Our Divine Redeemer's immense charity and the effusions of His love." (1) And Father de Gallifet observes: "Even if the nature of this feast (of the Sacred Heart) be not very attentively considered, it will be understood and felt that, under the title of the Heart of Jesus, it is in reality the feast of the love of Jesus." (2) Then in the Breviary (3) we read that "the feast was granted in order that under the symbol of this Most Holy Heart, the faithful might celebrate the love of Christ with more fervor and devotion."

However, we must not, as several writers seem to have done, distinguish as two parallel objects of the devotion to the Sacred Heart, the one material or sensible, the other formal or spiritual; and Father Terrien very appropriately remarks (4) that if there were two separable objects there would be two devotions to the Sacred Heart. On the contrary, the

---

(1) Letter to Scipio Ricci, Bishop of Prato-Pistoia.

(2) New observations for the concession of the Office and the Mass of the Sacred Heart. Observation II quoted by Father Nilles, *De Rationibus* . . . edit. 5, vol. I, p. 336.

(3) Lesson VI of the Office.

(4) *La Dévotion au Sacré Cœur de Jésus*, chap. III, p. 34.

formal and the material object of the devotion must simply be the two elements, one material and the other formal, of one and the same object and in the present case, thanks to symbolism, they can be so. As Father de Gallifet says: "The immediate object of the feast is the love which makes the heart burn, the love which, with the heart, forms an indivisible whole." (1)

The heart and the love are one and the same object; either the heart is the real symbol of love, or love is symbolized by the heart. "Note, then," says Father J. B. Terrien, "the proper object of the devotion to the Sacred Heart: it is neither the Heart of flesh to the exclusion of the love, nor the love to the exclusion of the Heart, but Heart and love combined. Whosoever says 'Heart of Jesus' says both of these things, or, rather, but one thing composed, so to speak, of two inseparable elements joined in the unity of one object, as the body and soul are combined in the substantial unity of one and the same nature. I adore the material Heart of Jesus, but in adoring It I consider It the living symbol which personifies for me all His love; I adore the Love of Jesus, but in adoring It I contemplate It in the natural and sensible manifestation in which Jesus shows It to me in His Heart of Flesh. Love is certainly the *principal* element, as the acts which go to make up this devotion do not descend from love to the heart, but rise from the heart to love. However, the physical Heart is the sacred *auxiliary* element which puts that love within the range of my weakness: as it is through the heart that it is revealed to me, that it touches me and that I attain to it." (2)

These considerations contain at the same time the answer to this interesting question: Is the worship of the physical Heart of Our Lord essential to the devotion to the Sacred Heart? The question is practical only insofar as it deals with

(1) In the apology offered Benedict XIII, book II, chap. 2, quoted by Nilles, *De Rationibus* . . . edit. 5, vol. I, p. 340.

(2) *La Dévotion au Sacré Cœur de Jésus*, chap. IV, p. 37. We quote this author all the more willingly now, as later on we shall have to contradict him.

*private* devotion. In *public* worship it is of paramount necessity to present the devotion to the Sacred Heart such as it was made known by Blessed Margaret Mary and has been approved by the Church, and the real, living Heart is an indispensable element of it. To take It away would be to advance the cause of the enemies of the devotion, to render it less accessible to all under pretext of spiritualizing it; in fact, it would be almost like replacing Jesus Christ by His Soul.

If, even in private, we were to conceive a most commendable worship with Our Lord's love as its exclusive object, such a worship would not be of the Sacred Heart. It would, of course, retain the principal element of it and thereby resemble it, but the material element would be lacking. In the same way every devotion to the sufferings of Our Lord is not necessarily that of the Five Wounds which symbolize these sufferings. Of course, the representation of the physical heart will be more or less vivid in proportion to one's temperament and inclinations, but surely there is none who considers himself so far above the common conditions of humanity as to think that he does not require the help of symbols, above all of those which the Divine Goodness providentially metes out to our present weakness.

## CHAPTER V.

### THE LOVE OF WHICH THE HEART OF JESUS IS THE SYMBOL.

It was for a purpose that, in the preceding section, we spoke of Christ's love without defining it, and the reader may have discovered a hiatus. Indeed, perhaps more than once he has wondered to what particular love we referred: whether it was the love of Christ for mankind, the love which He feels in His two natures, or only that emanating from His human nature. Now, by clearing up this doubt, we shall settle the question we had in view when undertaking this work and the importance of which cannot be denied. For the sake of clearness we will divide this section into several paragraphs.



1. *The Mystery of the Incarnation. Created and Uncreated Love. The Question Considered from This Point of View.*

This first paragraph connects the question with the most consoling mystery of our faith, the mystery of the Incarnate Word. We must scrupulously preserve the Catholic conception of it and, consequently, not depart even in our mode of expression from usages accepted by the Church. And now we shall reflect for a moment upon the principal points of the dogma of the Word made Flesh.

Decided upon and executed by the entire Trinity, attributed to the Holy Ghost, inasmuch as it is a supreme favor of Divine love,(1) the work of the Incarnation gave human nature to only the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, the Word of God called since the Incarnation, Jesus Christ. During the course of centuries a more exact concept of this dogma of love was formed because of the necessity of refuting opposing heresies, but we shall restrict our references to the principal among them. Nestorius (439) destroyed theandric union by distinguishing two personalities in Christ: the human personality, born of the Virgin Mary and the personality of the Word, begotten of the Father from all eternity. Thanks to a union, which was begun at the conception of the Son of Mary and which was to receive from the subsequent merits of the human person thus deified its confirmation and achievement, these two persons were, according to Nestorius, inseparably united, even to forming a single moral person and to making the human person participate in honors peculiar to the Eternal Word. Despite a certain excellence, this union savored of the nature of momentary communications with which the Divinity honored the prophets.(2) By a contrary tendency, the Monophysite sects, following the monk Eutyches (454), concluded or inferred from the unity of person a unity of compound nature, which, from the time of the Incarnation

---

(1) Saint Thomas's *Summa theologiae*, part III, q. XXXII, a. 1.

(2) See Franzelin, *De Verbo incarnato*, edit. 2, th. 22, especially at the end, p. 182.



of the Word, constituted the divine and the human nature.(1) This heresy, anathematized by the Council of Chalcedon, which took place twenty years after that of Ephesus (431), at which Nestorius was condemned, reappeared under a new form with the Monothelites. While admitting two essential natures in the Word, these heretics did not understand how human nature could be for Christ what it is for us, the principle of a whole order of activity. According to them, Christ had in His divine nature the immediate principle of all action, of all submission; whereas, in operating and in suffering, He made use of His human nature as of an inert instrument destitute of will and energy.(2) In confronting these errors the Church shows herself equally jealous of preserving the unity of person and the distinction of two natures: the divine nature common with all its perfections and all its tendencies to the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, and the human nature, body and soul complete, peculiar, with all its operations and tendencies, to the Incarnate Word. In other words, the substantial union of the human nature with God was not made in the divine nature but in the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, the person identified with that nature. How the union could be accomplished in the person, without being accomplished in a nature identical with that person, is a mystery deep as the unfathomable abyss of the mystery of the Blessed Trinity. However, we know and we profess that the personal union excludes all absorption of one nature by the other, as also all confusion, all commingling of the divine and human natures, for from that would result a third nature composed of the two preceding ones.

Hence, in Jesus Christ there are two natures, two wills, combining harmoniously and subordinate one to the other, but physically and essentially distinct, and of which the distinction as well as the reality must be maintained. Now, admitted that there are two wills, there must also be two loves. In Christ there is eternal, uncreated love identified with the

(1) *Ibid.*, th. 21, p. 172.

(2) *Ibid.*, th. 40, p. 387.

Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost, and a created love, human and sanctified, whereby Christ loves His Father and also loves us.

Therefore, naturally enough, the question arises: *Since by the worship of the Sacred Heart, we especially honor the love of Jesus Christ, which love is it?* The love that created the universe or the most sublime of all *created* loves? The love that created Lazarus or the love that wept over him?

In other words, as Father Nilles(1) expresses it: the object of the devotion to the Sacred Heart is not a metaphorical heart, nor indeed the real heart taken in itself absolutely, but the heart, as a *real symbol of love*. *Now, of what love is it the symbol in the worship of the Sacred Heart?*

We must remember that the love which Christ bears us in His human nature is not a purely human love; it is divine in consideration of the person; it is the love of a God, and therefore its dignity and value are infinite. We should call it *theandric* rather than human, as it is the love of a God in the human nature assumed by Him.

But we mean to return to these ideas and dwell upon them at greater length. First, in order the better to rid ourselves of all preconceived notions and dispose ourselves to make an impartial examination, we shall review the opinions set forth by different authors or reflected in the decisions of the Holy See. Readers already convinced that the difference of opinions on this question gives us entire freedom of thought, and that the ambiguity and confusion of views render an exact and methodical exposition most desirable, may pass over this paragraph and without further delay delve into the very depths of the subject.

## 2. *Authors' Opinions.*

*Preliminary observations.* Two remarks will enable us the better to understand the ideas of these authors.

1. If we attribute to the love of Christ characteristics *all* of which are suited to His created love (such is even the qualifi-

---

(1) Cor Jesu ut caritatis symbolum, p. 9-25.

cation "divine" given to His love) we equivalently and tacitly exclude uncreated love. In fact, (a) the love of a human heart is itself considered human unless the contrary be said of it; (b) if uncreated charity be assigned a place, it should be in the first rank. That we should be satisfied with presupposing what is evidently the principal element is past belief.

2. The love of Christ to which we owe the Passion and the Eucharist must be the love He bears us in His human nature. (a) It was as man that Christ died for us; it was in consequence of an excellence peculiar to human nature that He instituted the Sacraments and accordingly the Blessed Eucharist.(1) It is only by divine power that the Sacraments operate the interior effect of sanctification; but this power and this operation, though common to the Blessed Trinity, are attributed to the Holy Ghost; it would not, therefore, be very theological to ascribe them to the love of Christ. (b) Moreover, by way of confirmation, we can invoke the argument of authority. Lesson VI of the Office recognizes in the Sacred Heart the symbol of the love of Christ suffering and instituting the Holy Eucharist. Marquès(2) concludes that here there is only question of created love. Father de San says that, properly speaking, the Heart of Jesus symbolizes created love, especially that which gave us the Passion and the Eucharist.(3) Father Nilles expresses himself still more explicitly:(4) "Just as Christ as man suffered for us, and as such renews in the Eucharist the memory of His Passion, so the Passion and the Eucharist are the principal demonstrations of the love He bears us *in His human nature*." Among those operations which, in the humanity of Christ, are worthy of adoration, Cardinal Franzelin ranks the love to which the Church is indebted for the spiritual nourishment of the Sacraments.(5)

Here, then, are different opinions on the subject we are

---

(1) Saint Thomas's *Summa theologia*, part III, q. XLIV, a. 3.

(2) *Defensio cultus*, p. 2, n. 18.

(3) *De Verbo incarnato*, c. 21.

(4) *Cor Jesu divini Redemptoris nostri caritatis symbolum*, p. 26.

(5) *De Verbo incarnato*, p. 467.



discussing, gathered from among authorized representatives of the devotion to the Sacred Heart or of theological science:

1. In the annals of the devotion to the Sacred Heart, the first name to be inscribed after that of Blessed Margaret Mary is that of the spiritual guide sent her by God to acknowledge the divine and supernatural origin of the revelations concerning the Sacred Heart. The venerable Father de La Colombière, S.J., considers the Divine Heart the "seat of all virtues, the source of all blessings and the refuge of all holy souls." He says that the principal virtues to be honored in that Heart are Its respectful, humble love for God the Father, Its patience with and grief for our sins, Its sensible compassion for our misery, Its immense love despite this same misery, and Its absolute equanimity caused by perfect conformity with the divine will. "The sentiments of this Heart are still the same. . . . For all that, It finds in the hearts of men only unkindness, forgetfulness, contempt, ingratitude; It loves, but is not loved in return. . . . In reparation for so many insults" the holy religious consecrates his own heart and abandons himself entirely to It.(1) We do not think that Father de La Colombière expresses himself anywhere more clearly upon the devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus. Now, judged according to these expressions, not only does the Heart Itself belong to the humanity, but all the sentiments acknowledged and honored therein are divine sentiments which *Our Lord feels in His human nature*.

2. At the earnest solicitation of Blessed Margaret Mary, Father J. Croiset, S.J., explained the devotion to the Sacred Heart in a book, of which she said:(2) "If I mistake not,(3) it is all so perfectly in accord with His (Our Lord's) desire, that I do not think any of it needs to be changed."

Without making a formal statement to that effect, Father Croiset shows most unmistakably that he considers only the

---

(1) *Spiritual Retreat*, Offering to the Sacred Heart at the end.

(2) Letter to Father Croiset, Aug. 21, 1690.

(3) We know that Blessed Margaret Mary was under obedience thus to temper her expressions.

Saviour's human heart and created love the special object of devotion to the Sacred Heart. He attributes the excellence of the adorable Heart of Jesus to Its union with the Divine Person and to the virtues with which the Heart is adorned;(1) and the benefits to which he refers in paragraph 3 of chapter III are those of the Redemption and the institution of the Blessed Eucharist. In the following words he sums up the economy of Christ's love: "God has rendered Himself more sensible, so to speak, by becoming man, and *this same man* has done even what is beyond our power of conception, in order to make men love Him. . . . Such, then, are the effects of the love of Jesus for us." Finally, the first lines of the work thus define the particular object of the devotion: "It was the immense love of the Son of God which led Him to deliver Himself up to death for us and to give Himself entirely to us in the Most Holy Sacrament of the Altar, and even the sight of all the ingratitude and all the insults which He was to receive as a Victim immolated to the end of time did not deter Him from working this miracle."(2)

3. Father Froment, S.J., the contemporary of Father Croiset, composed at the same time as the latter a treatise on *The True Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus*. Only the date of its appearance induces us to quote from a work which met with scarcely any success. Father Sommervogel(3) mentions but one edition of it, and the treatise, fallen into oblivion, had become very rare, when it was reprinted in the *Petite Bibliothèque chrétienne*.(4) From the beginning, the author considers the Heart of Jesus in its very broadest ac-

(1) Part I, chap. III, sec. 1.

(2) We quote the edition of Father de Franciosi, Montreuil, 1895. The omission of certain formalities caused Father Croiset's book to be put on the Index, March 11, 1704. It was withdrawn August 24, 1887, thanks to the urgent measures taken by Mgr. Stadler, Archbishop of Vrhbosine. At the head of his edition Father de Franciosi inserted a dedicatory epistle in which these measures are brought to light.

(3) *Bibliothèque des écrivains de la Compagnie de Jésus*.

(4) Brussels, Vromant, 1891. The simultaneous composition of the treatises of Fathers Froment and Croiset was the occasion of some embarrassment to Blessed Margaret Mary, as may be seen from her letter of February 18, 1690, to Father Croiset, quoted by Letierce in *Étude sur le Sacré Cœur*, vol. II, p. 27.

ception: "The Heart of Jesus may be regarded in different ways, namely, not merely as the *Heart of Flesh*, which constitutes a part of the adorable Body of the Son of God, but also as the *will*, divine as well as human, of this God-Man, which will has always loved us with an ardent love; and lastly, as this same love. In all these different ways the Heart of Jesus is considered throughout this work, which is to say that It is looked upon as the seat of that excessive love which led Him to deliver Himself unto death for us and to give Himself to us till the end of time in the Blessed Sacrament, the masterpiece of His Divine Heart and the consummation of His love for men who treat Him with naught save coldness and indifference." These lines seem to us somewhat confused, and in his development the author is losing sight of uncreated love.

4. Perhaps no one worked more efficaciously for the approbation of the public worship of the Sacred Heart than the celebrated Father de Gallifet, S.J., a disciple of Father de La Colombière, and restored to health after a vow made by Father Croiset. The entreaties which finally won the approval of the Holy See either came from him or were inspired by his writings, and his work on *The Excellence of the Devotion to the Sacred Heart* was soon "considered the manual par excellence of the devotion." (1) Few authorities can be compared with him. Now, from his book and his defense it appears clearly that he considers the created love of Christ the special (spiritual) (2) object of the devotion to the Sacred Heart. He explains the entire worship of the Sacred Heart by the hypostatic union of the Heart of Jesus with the Person of the Word and a love of which this Heart must have felt the impressions. "As the love," he says, "with which the Lord Jesus as man has loved God the Father and men themselves, was conceived according to the manner peculiar to human nature, it follows that to the intense spiritual love of

(1) Letierce, *op. cit.*, p. 153.

(2) In fact he distinguishes between a *sensible object*, the heart and a *spiritual object* formed by love.



the Soul of Christ, there should be a corresponding sensible, proportionate love in the Heart.”(1) He then exalts the Heart of Jesus by beholding in It a noble part of the body; he observes the relations of that Heart with the affections of the soul, Its union with the Divine Person, the love with which It burns for God, the sanctity of the Word, in which It participates, the gifts which the Holy Ghost has bestowed upon It, and the glory that It gives to God. And as regards man, he adds, this Heart is that of their Redeemer.(2)

5. Cardinal Gerdil(3) frequently repeats that the Heart of Jesus Christ is taken as the symbol of Christ’s *immense love*, but he does not state whether this love is created or uncreated. His silence leads us to believe that he thought only of the sentiments of human nature, the more so, as he gives for a reason, in favor of the worship, that Christ Himself sanctioned our attributing to the heart the *affections* and *sentiments* of the soul.

6. Benoît Tetamo, S.J., wrote his *Dissertation apologétique sur le culte du Sacré Cœur* in 1772. In the Appendix I, chapter 1, he acknowledges that the Heart of Jesus symbolizes both uncreated and created love. A decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, in 1765, to which we will refer later, would seem to have inspired his opinion. At the close of chapter 2, he declares that it would be no more difficult for a heart of flesh to symbolize uncreated love than for the word *heart* to express the love of God.

7. A little later, in 1781, Emmanuel Marquès, a member of the suppressed Society, published his celebrated work, *Defensio cultus Sacratissimi Cordis Jesu*.(4) He deals very explicitly with the question that interests us, and here is the gist of his reply. (a) The worship and the feast of the Sacred

(1) *De cultu* . . . , book I, chap. 1.

(2) *Ibid.*, book II, chap. I. It is as man and not in His divine nature that Christ is Mediator and Redeemer. St. Paul’s *First Epistle to Timothy*, II, 5. See Franzelin’s *De Verbo incarnato*, th. 46, p. 497.

(3) *Animadversiones in notas Cl. Feller de nonnullis propositionibus damnatis Pistoriensis synodi. Animadversio 2; et nota ex animadversione. Opera*, vol. XIV, pp. 348 and 374. Romæ, 1809.

(4) *Defensio cultus SS. Cordis Jesu*, pars. 2, propositio 1a, n. 15-19.

Heart formally refer to Christ's love of mankind, not to His love of God. (b) This love is, strictly speaking, created love, especially that which the Saviour manifested for us in His Passion and in the Eucharist. In reality the Heart of Jesus has not the affinity and analogy with uncreated love upon which its symbolism is founded, and in the Office of the feast, the Church expressly declares that the love of our suffering Saviour is honored by renewing in the Holy Eucharist the memory of His death. The prayer of the feast recalls the same benefits. Indeed the entire Office, as is shown by the responses after the lessons, is divided between these two mysteries of love. (c) However, the admirable conformity of the human will of Christ with the divine will reveals to us in the created love of Christ a perfect imitation of the uncreated love. Consequently the symbol of the one becomes, in a measure, the symbol of the other; and uncreated love may be understood in a broad sense in the worship of the Sacred Heart. In support of this opinion Marquès refers to the decree of 1765, from which we have already quoted, and which reads thus: "By the celebration of the Office and of the Mass, we symbolically renew the memory of this divine love by which the only Son of God assumed human nature." "Behold," says Marquès, "uncreated love." The decree adds: "And (through love) becoming obedient even unto death, (the Son of God) declared that He gave Himself to men as an example of meekness and humility of heart." "Behold," resumes Marquès, "created love."

8. According to the celebrated François-Antoine Zaccaria, S.J., the worship of the Sacred Heart is indeed that of the humanity of the Word; the Heart of Christ does not in any way participate in uncreated love, but only in created love, and the object of the feast could not be a purely symbolical heart; it is the real Heart of the Saviour, united to the humanity and to the Person of the Word and symbol of love.(1)

---

(1) *Antidoto contra i libri prodotti o da prodursi dal sign. Blasi intorno alla divozione al S. Cuore di Gesù.*, p. 20, 21, 33, 61 et n. 16, p. 108. Florence, 1773.

Therefore, Zaccaria seems to limit the special object of the devotion to the Sacred Heart to created love.

9. The works of the learned and pious Muzzarelli (1768-1813) always bear the stamp of rich erudition and unquestionable orthodoxy, but it does not seem to us that his *dissertation on the rules for speaking and writing with precision on the devotion and worship due to the Sacred Heart* furnish the clear and accurate ideas which it was his intention to convey, and which his talent would have led us to expect. Deviating from the ordinary(1) language which he thinks he uses, Muzzarelli makes Jesus Christ Himself the material, real and *proper* object of the feast and of the devotion to the Sacred Heart. The heart is the formal object, that which gives rise to the worship. The heart can be taken either in the proper sense, namely, as the heart of flesh, the victim of love, in which event it cannot receive appellations of a divine nature,(2) or in a symbolical or metaphorical(3) sense, which may be applied to the created or uncreated will, to created or uncreated love. The Church has varied her expressions, thereby proving her intention to associate the two concepts. It is in the formula inserted in the preface that Muzzarelli expresses himself the most clearly. "The material, *proper, immediate and direct* object of the feast of the Sacred Heart of Jesus is Jesus Christ Himself, and this feast is occasioned or given rise to by the memory of His immense love represented under the symbol of His Sacred Heart or the Heart a victim of love."

10. Without formally discussing the question, Father Roothaan transmits his ideas on the worship of the Sacred Heart of Jesus in a letter addressed to the Society of which he was the Father General. In this worship, he says, the faithful celebrate the benefits conferred by a loving Saviour, namely, His Passion, death and the institution of the Holy

(1) Fr. Letierce acknowledges it, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 440 note.

(2) He acknowledges, however (p. 16), that the expression, "The Heart of Jesus has loved us with an infinite love," may mean His created love which is of infinite dignity.—We quote from the French, Avignon edition 1826, because we have not the Italian edition at hand.

(3) We will continue to insist that these two expressions are not synonymous. (See above, section IV.)



Eucharist, and take upon themselves reparation for the insults of which He is the object, principally in this mystery of love. The love of the Sacred Heart is that "which led Jesus Christ to sacrifice Himself during His entire life, even from His conception, especially in His Passion and death and in the Holy Eucharist, where He continues to be our Victim." (1)

11. Father Gautrelet, S.J., having clearly stated that the Heart of Our Lord represents and completely embodies His sacred humanity, seems reasonably to conclude from the hypostatic union of the Heart with the Person, that we find therein Jesus Christ entire, and hence also the love of the divine nature. He, however, specifies nothing more. (2)

12. Whoever reads attentively the pages which the learned C. Franzelin, S.J., in his treatise *De Verbo incarnato*, (3) devotes to the adoration of the humanity of Christ and especially of His Sacred Heart, will be readily convinced that, according to this author, the special object of worship is the love of Christ in His human nature. Not only is there not a word to indicate that the Heart of Our Lord is also the symbol of a love adorable in itself and by itself, but moreover, (4) (a) he likens the worship of the Sacred Heart to the worship of the mysteries of the Incarnate Word: "In all these mysteries the complete object of worship is the Word, acting and suffering in His humanity." (b) He draws a parallel between the worship of the Sacred Heart and that of the Five Wounds, the latter worship corresponding, as it were, to the exterior life and passion of the Incarnate Word and the former to His interior life and passion. (c) The heart is considered as manifesting the theandric affections and as the symbol of the love and of all the interior life of the Redeemer, the God-Man. Now, it is in His human nature that Our Lord is Restorer and Redeemer.

13. Father de San, in his manuscript (5) treatise, and Father

---

(1) *Litteræ de cultu SS. Cordis Jesu*, pp. 8, 13. Anvers, 1848.

(2) *Manuel de la dévotion au Sacré Cœur*, art. 2.

(3) We quote from the second edition, Rome, 1874.

(4) P. 468, III.—5 P. 461.

(5) *De Verbo incarnato*, chap. XXI.

Nilles(1) adopt the opinion of Marquès. In a strict sense the Heart of Jesus symbolizes only created love; in a broader sense it symbolizes uncreated love also. Father Nix, in his *Cultus SS. Cordis Jesu*, does not differ notably from these other authors when he makes created love the proximate and immediate object of worship and uncreated love its ultimate object.(2)

14. In his great work *De SS. Corde Jesu, ejusque cultu*, Canon Leroy makes the divine and the human love of Christ the object of the worship of the Sacred Heart.(3)

15. Father Bucceroni, S.J., in his *Commentarii in cultum SS. Cordis Jesu*, agrees with Muzzarelli. He, too, distinguishes between the heart taken in the proper and the metaphorical sense, and as it may symbolize both created and uncreated love, it is therefore the formal object of the devotion to the Sacred Heart.(4)

16. In his beautiful work, *The Devotion to the Heart of Jesus*,(5) Father Bernard Dalgairns, the English Oratorian, alludes merely to created love.

17. According to Father Chevalier, founder of the Missionaries of the Sacred Heart, and several late writers, the scope of the devotion is indefinitely extended. They behold the Heart of Jesus in the Word by Whom all things were made; and the foundation of the devotion must therefore have been co-incident with the creation of the world.(6)

18. "In the Incarnate Word," says Father Billot, "the Heart is at once the symbol of uncreated love which caused the Word to descend upon earth, and of created love which, bursting forth from the first instant, led Him even unto the cross."(7)

---

(1) *Cor Jesu, divini Redemptoris Nostri caritatis symbolum*. Innsbruck, 1872. He here expresses his opinion on the present question more clearly than in his large work.

(2) P. 40.

(3) See n. 175. He similarly expresses himself in his *Litany of the Sacred Heart*.

(4) See pp. 11, 12, 21, 22.

(5) See chapters II and III especially.

(6) *Le Sacré Cœur de Jésus*, Paris, 1886.

(7) *De Verbo incarnato*, th. 36, p. 332.

19. In developing their theses on the worship of the Sacred Heart,(1) Fathers A. Martorell and Joseph Castella, S.J., admit that this worship includes both uncreated and created love, although the latter is more strictly its object.

20. Father J. B. Terrien, S.J., is credited with a very clear exposition of the question and gives, categorically, the widest range to the object. "The answer," he says, "cannot be doubtful. . . . Who would permit us, when meditating on the love of Christ, to parcel out that love, as it were, and to separate what has been joined in such divine harmony? How could I behold in my Saviour at the tomb of His friend Lazarus, the love of a God Who is absolute Master of death and the love at once spiritual and sensible, of a man who consoles Martha and Mary, and is moved even to tears, and then deliberately make a choice among these manifestations of love, accepting some and rejecting others, instead of adoring and loving the Lord Jesus in the unity of His multiple love?" "What God hath joined together let no man put asunder," He tells us in His Gospel. Elsewhere Father Terrien says that we should not totally exclude from this worship the love of Our Lord for His Father.(2)

Notwithstanding our respect for the knowledge and piety of a writer so worthy in the sight of the Sacred Heart and the Blessed Virgin,(3) we cannot but feel that the energy of his statement far outweighs the value of the proofs furnished. There is no question of parceling out love, but of better safeguarding a distinction which Our Lord inculcates even in the very place to which Father Terrien refers. To whom does Jesus attribute the operation and consequently the love of the Divinity? Is it not to the Father Whom He thanks for having heard His prayer?(4) There is no question of disturbing the harmony between the two loves, but rather of preserving

---

(1) *Theses de cultu SS. Cordis Jesu.*

(2) *La Dévotion au Sacré Cœur de Jésus*, pp. 80, 81, 86, 87.

(3) Cf. the well known work; *La Mère de Dieu et la Mère des hommes.*

(4) Gospel according to St. John XI, 14.



their order of subordination by ascending gradually from the created to the uncreated love. And here the suggestion is in place: "Those things which God hath distinguished let no man confound." (1)

21. Answering our question, the Abbé Baruteil, in his recent volume *Genèse du culte du Sacré Cœur de Jésus*, (2) expresses himself thus: "By the love of Jesus, which is honored as the object of this devotion, we must understand the love of the Son of God for His Father and for mankind, before as well as after His Incarnation, but in a certain order which should be accurately defined." (3) And farther on he acknowledges that "the principal object of the worship of the Sacred Heart is Its love *for us* both as God and as man."

22. Still more recently, the *Messenger of the Sacred Heart* reproduced (4) articles published by Father Thill in the *Theologische Quartalschrift* of Linz, under the title of *The Heart in the Devotion to the Sacred Heart*. After a very scholarly exposition of the meanings of the word Heart, and explanations concentrating all attention upon the humanity of Jesus Christ, the learned writer formulates this assertion: "This love of the Man-God is at the same time human and divine, and, as

---

(1) The author is mistaken in regard to both the value and the meaning of the Acts of the Holy See, of which, p. 81, he invokes the authority as incontestable. Indeed he can only quote one stanza of the hymn of Lauds and the decree of 1765. In spite of the fact that the authority of a poetic expression can never rank above the clear the exact formula of the 6th Lesson of the same Office, and that the decree of 1765 has been withdrawn from the collection of authentic decrees, both one and the other document attributes to divine love the Incarnation only. Why, we shall state in our conclusions later on. It is true that, on p. 82, may be found the answer of the Congregation of Rites, but this answer is in reality only one of the preambles that the Secretary of the Congregation claims to have been looked into by the Sacred Congregation before solving the doubts inserted in a rescript of April 3, 1821, and silently passed over in the authentic Decrees. In the non-authentic edition, this decree bore the number 4579 and the Secretary's account was in a note. However, this account also referred to the decree of 1765 and attributed to the Heart of Jesus only the Incarnation, the institution of the Blessed Sacrament and the sacrifice of the Cross. (See later on our remarks on the decree of 1765.)

(2) Paris, 1904.

(3) P. 152.—3, P. 154.

(4) June, 1905, etc.

such, is eternal, sovereignly wise, all-powerful and infinitely merciful.”(1)

We think it useless further to multiply quotations. There is ample testimony in favor of the cause we wish to defend, and what we said at the beginning of the paragraph is henceforth established: the variety of opinions leaves room for serious discussion, and the vagueness of statements makes us wish for greater precision. We shall now consult the Acts of the Holy See.

### 3. *Decrees of the Holy See.*

1. In the first place we shall quote from the *Memorial* presented by the bishops of Poland and the Roman Archconfraternity to the Congregation of Rites. Although not emanating from the Holy See, this document nevertheless clearly expresses its views; in fact, the decree of January 26, 1765, rendered by the Congregation of Rites, simply declares its assent to the petition of the bishops and the Archconfraternity, without making therein a single correction. Since that time “it is manifest that the different questions on the *nature, object* and end of the worship of the Heart of Jesus, such as it is approved by the Church, could not be discussed without considering the doctrine of the *Memorial*.”(2)

Now, this *Memorial* is constantly referring to Father de Gallifet, and, like him, the signers declare that Christ is the primary object of the devotion, that its secondary object is the Heart, and that this Heart must be considered as inflamed with love for men and deeply injured by their ingratitude. It is inflamed with love because the love with which Christ Jesus loved His Father and mankind was conceived in a human

---

(1) P. 355. It were useless to state that this expression cannot be taken literally. It would be evidently contrary to the author's idea to acknowledge in Christ a love really human, at the same time as divine. The two loves belonging to the same Christ cannot be blended into one. Their unity can be but objective; it results from a perfect agreement which shows us above the created will, an uncreated will tending toward the same end.

(2) Nilles, *De Rationibus* . . . 5, vol. I, chap. III, p. 153.

way: hence there was in the heart a sensible love corresponding to the spiritual love residing in the soul.(1)

The last *Memorial*, presented under Benedict XIII and published by Father Nilles, is couched in the same language. Wherefore a special devotion to the Sacred Heart? Because of the affections of that Heart; because, to the exclusion of all other parts, that part of the humanity experienced the strongest impressions of love, sorrow, contrition and compassion; "the immense love of Our Lord Jesus Christ is not only therein contained and represented, but, as it were, inscribed and sculptured." (2) All this is Christ's love in His humanity.

2. In the Office approved for the entire Church, Clement XIII and the Congregation of Rites indicate as the object of the feast the love which led Christ to die for us and to institute in our behalf the Holy Sacrament of the Altar.

3. Pius VI similarly expresses himself in a letter to the Bishop of Pistoja on June 29. "The substance of the devotion to the Sacred Heart consists in meditating upon and venerating, in the Heart as a symbolic image, the immense charity, the loving prodigality of Our Divine Redeemer." (3) These words, taken in their proper sense, point out to us as the formal and special object of worship, the love which Our Lord bears us as *Redeemer*. What St. Augustine said of mediation (4) holds good for the Redemption: Christ is Redeemer in His human nature, not in His divine nature. His human nature, then, is the seat of this love.

4. Two concessions of the feast given by Pius VII indicate the same object as does the invitatory in the Office: "Let us adore Christ Who has suffered for us." "We have hearkened," said the Pope, "to the wishes of the faithful who desired to see the worship of the Heart of Jesus amplified, to

---

(1) See, for instance, Nos. 27, 34, 37, 38 in Nilles' *De Rationibus* . . . 5, pp. 113, 120.

(2) Nilles, *De Rationibus* . . . 5, pp. 74-76.

(3) Nilles, *De Rationibus* . . . p. 334, note, or p. 344.

(4) "Non quia Deus, sed quia homo." *Enarrationes* in Ps. 103, n. 8. (Migne, *P. L.*, vol. XXXVI, col. 1383.)



celebrate with greater fervor the excessive charity of Our Lord Jesus Christ suffering and dying for the redemption of mankind.”(1)

5. In the decree of August 23, 1853, in which he gave to the entire Church the feast of the Sacred Heart, and also in the brief of the beatification of Blessed Margaret Mary, Pius IX considers the worship of the Sacred Heart that of the immense charity of the Heart of Jesus . . . the means of enkindling in men the flame of love with which the Heart of Jesus burns; it is the worship of the Heart burning with love for mankind; it is the worship of the Heart, seat of divine charity.”(2) The love of which the Heart is the seat, with which It is inflamed and which It desires to communicate, is the love conceived in the human nature.

6. *Most of the Fathers of the Vatican Council*, in their petition for the elevation of the rite of the feast, defined the object of the devotion as the love of Christ under the symbol of His Heart. They recall that the Pope created “a new legion of apostles, those men who unite their prayers to the prayers of the Heart of Jesus, always living to make intercession in our behalf.”(3)

7. We have purposely reserved, as worthy of the closest examination, the decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, contemporary with the approbation of the Office, by which on February 6, 1765, the Holy See proclaimed: the “Mass and Office tend to symbolically renew the divine love, under the impulse of which the only Son of God assumed human nature and, becoming obedient even unto death, declared that He thereby gave mankind an example of the meekness of His Heart.”

First of all, let us observe that this decree, inserted in the preceding editions, was taken out of the official collection of the decisions of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, and that its suppression prevents us from depending too much upon it.

---

(1) Nilles, *De Rationibus* . . . 5, p. 345.

(2) *Ibid.*, pp. 346, 347.

(3) Nilles, *De Rationibus* . . . , p. 190.

In fact the committee on revision adopted as a rule the rejection of useless and contradictory decrees: deeming useless, those repeated to satiety and contradictory, such as conflicted with other decrees or certain prescriptions of law or liturgy.(1) Consequently, were the discussion of this decree to inconvenience us in any way, we would not need to consider it; but at this stage of our work it behooves us to explain its meaning.

Its text, strictly understood, leads Marquès and several others(2) to conclude that the love therein mentioned is a divine love common to the Trinity, and a human love peculiar to Christ. The obedience even unto death, the meekness and humility of heart, bespeak a created love, and as the love that caused the Incarnation necessarily preceded this created love, it would seem identified with the divine nature. We are not at all reluctant to subscribe to this interpretation.

Is it, however, the only interpretation of which the text is susceptible? We shall see. In the mystery of our redemption, God wished to emphasize the tenderness as well as the power of His providence. Theology teaches us that He deigned to make our salvation depend upon the Incarnate Word's voluntary acceptance of His mission and death. Moreover, from the very beginning of His earthly existence, Christ had the full use of reason and, according to St. Paul,(3) it was at His entrance into the world that He accepted the immolation of His entire life conformably to the will of His Father. "Behold, O Father, I come to do Thy Will." Behold I come, not by the effect of my human will but accepting, in that will, my Incarnation, just as in the Garden of Olives, that will shall accept my sufferings, thus directing my humanity toward the salvation of men. To this concomitant will

---

(1) Introduction, p. 14. The Sacred Congregation is at present being questioned as to the motives of this rejection, but we do not know whether it will see fit to explain.

(2) Especially the Secretary of the Sacred Congregation of Rites in his second observation. But this observation is already charged with error on another ground. See Nilles' *De Rationibus* . . . , pp. 163, 164, note.

(3) *Hebr.*, X, 5-10.

the Incarnation itself may be ascribed. By an anticipation all the more natural here as the Person of Christ is eternal, we refer to a moment prior to the Incarnation a love which is really concomitant and logically subsequent. We are surely familiar with the much-used allegory that represents the Word as offering Himself to His Father for the salvation of humanity; and is not the truth which corresponds to this picture entirely in the human will of the Saviour? Is it not simply another way of presenting the passage in the *Epistle to the Hebrews*?

The following considerations militate in favor of this explanation in such perfect accord with the passage in the *Epistle*. The text of the decree, if we will re-read it, makes the Incarnation and the examples of meekness and humility depend upon an *impulse of love* (*amorem quo*). Now this language is not only indefinite, but even inaccurate if, in the first place, love is uncreated, and in the second, created. In fact, the love of the divine nature is different from the love of the human nature; it is even *exterior* to this nature. Indeed, such language used by the Church might well cause surprise, seeing that she is interested in distinguishing between the two loves as carefully as she distinguishes between the natures and wills. Besides, the decree would interpose a love of which there is no trace in the lessons of the Office approved just at that time, and the eternal, infinite love would necessarily become the principal element. The learned writer François Antoine Zaccaria, S.J., comments on the common decree, and implies that in this passage there is no such question of uncreated but only of created love.

This second interpretation of the decision of 1765 is, therefore, not only the more plausible, but even more probable. Does it, however, correspond with the opinion of the Sacred Congregation? Let us compare the decree with the *Epistle to the Philippians* (II, 6-8): "Who being in the form (nature) of God, thought it not robbery, to be himself equal to God: but debased himself, taking the form (nature) of a servant,



being made to the likeness of men and in shape found as a man. He humbled himself, becoming obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." Does not the decree recall these last two phrases when it alludes to the divine love which led the only Son of God to become man and be obedient even unto death? And does it not again revert to St. Paul's views when it adds the Gospel passage of St. Matthew, (1) in which Our Lord makes Himself an example of meekness and humility? (2) In fact, in the 5th verse of the same chapter of the letter to the Philippians, the Apostle had exhorted the Christians to be of the same mind as Christ Jesus. Hence, it is certainly the Apostle who inspired the Sacred Congregation, and from this comparison we may conclude that, without directly explaining their opinion, the authors of the decree of 1765 wished simply to invest their words with the same meaning which those of St. Paul had.

It is true that St. Paul's words are open to controversial attack, but we think that they may be thus explained.

In the 6th verse St. Paul enunciates a permanent fact, Christ's possession of the divine nature, which fact is an inviolable claim to equality with God in honor and glory. To this dignity and this prerogative he opposes Christ's attitude on two occasions, when He forgets Himself in favor of us. (a) He divests Himself, so to speak, of the divine nature in assuming human nature, so as to be in all things like to other men; (b) in this nature He humbles Himself even to the death of the cross. In this second instance Christ forgets Himself in His human nature. Then why not, in the sense heretofore explained, also attribute the first instance of self-forgetfulness to human nature since, in the second *Epistle to the Corinthians* (VIII, 9), we are reminded that being rich, He became poor for our sakes: that through His poverty we might be rich; and since logic and the parallelism of the passage quoted from the *Epistle to the Hebrews* (X, 5-10) in-

(1) Matt., XI, 29.

(2) The literal sense of the text is: "Come and ascertain by experience the meekness and humility of My Heart."

vite us to do so. If such be the meaning of the verses of St. Paul, such is, at least implicitly, the idea of the authors of the decree of 1765; and since then there has been no other official document immediately proposing the love of the divine nature as the object of the devotion to the Sacred Heart.

#### 4. *Theological Examination of the Question.*

In accordance with our programme we shall go to the very bottom of the question which now absorbs us and which may be accurately stated in this way: The direct, immediate object of the devotion to the Sacred Heart, is the living Heart of Jesus Christ, inasmuch as It is the symbol of His love. *Is this love created love, uncreated love, or both?*

However, before going farther it would seem only fitting here to record the results of our little investigation and to sum up the impressions made by reading the *documents of the Holy See*, the *revelations* made to *Blessed Margaret Mary* and the writings of *approved authors*. Thus we shall be directly applying the principles set forth in part first on the sources to be consulted. Needless to say, these principles will not be lost to view in our reasoning.

1. The *documents of the Holy See* are silent on the subject of Our Lord's uncreated love and His love for His Father, if we except one which is of doubtful authority and questionable meaning.(1) Besides it discusses only the divine love that caused the Incarnation. See the conclusive proof heretofore given.

2. In the *great revelations* made to *Blèssed Margaret Mary* the love mentioned always seems that of a real heart; the manifestations which Our Lord there recalls and shows, so to speak, as engraven upon His Heart, are the Passion and the

---

(1) Père Terrien also refers to the hymn of Lauds which seems so effectively to recall the Incarnation and the Passion. We do not need to contradict, the more especially as we can freely accept the conclusion deduced from it. (See our conclusions.) But, as we have previously observed, it is clear that stanzas confined within a certain meter could never be set up against the exact teaching contained in the lessons of the Office.

Eucharist, and the love is at once intense and profoundly sorrowful. A *human* heart can love with created love only. "It was as man that Christ suffered for us; and as such He renews the memory of His Passion." (1) The Passion and the Eucharist prove to us the love which Christ manifests for us in His Human Nature. Only this love could really have been sorrowful. Is it not therefore natural to conclude that created love is the proper object of the devotion?

3. *Authors* are divided in their opinions. From the beginning some among them, and indeed the most celebrated, like Pères Croiset and de Gallifet, seemed to consider only created love; several acknowledge only uncreated love, though in a broad sense, while a few put both loves on an equality.

Let us then, by dint of reasoning, endeavor to reach clearer and more decisive conclusions.

To proceed as clearly as possible, we shall lead up to these conclusions by developing a series of special points, the first of which will not only enable us the better to grasp the truth, but will render it easier of acceptance by obviating certain mistakes which would detract from the sublimity of a devotion presented to us in so very rational and accessible a way.

A. *In What Sense Uncreated Love is Necessarily Understood in the Devotion to the Sacred Heart.*

1. Infinite and in Himself worthy of all love, God manifests to us His amiability and His perfections in effects which excite us to adore and love Him. When these effects—works or creatures—are foreign to all personality they receive no absolute honor, are not of themselves worthy of any worship or devotion, but they impel us to give homage to God, to His infinite perfections, especially to His goodness, and His love. If these effects constitute a created person, or something pertaining to a person divine or created, they do not cease to impel us to love God, His goodness, His love, but moreover, they are themselves a direct object of worship and of love:

(1) Martorelli and Castelle, *Theses* No. 115.



of a lesser worship and love if the person be inferior to God; of an identical worship when the perfection, although perhaps finite in essence, is nevertheless interior to a divine person. Hence God, the Blessed Trinity and uncreated love, could not be foreign to the worship of the Sacred Heart: the entire Humanity of Christ, His operations, sufferings and also His love, cause God to be loved and uncreated love to be glorified. This uncreated love is the *final object* of the devotion to the Sacred Heart.

2. Moreover, at the beginning of this study, we found that the *complete object* of a worship is always the person. By devotion to the Sacred Heart we honor Jesus Christ, adorable in all that belongs to Him, adorable because of His Divine Nature. Again in this sense His Divinity, and consequently His uncreated love, receive our homage.

In honoring the Heart of Jesus as the symbol of created love only, we do not deny the uncreated love common to the Word with the Father and the Holy Ghost; we do not withdraw it from the complete object of our homage, but we do not recognize it as the *special object* which directly occasions this homage; we adore and bless it in a manifestation apart from it and less sublime in essence, but closer to us and therefore more capable of impressing us; we assign a proper object to the devotion, an object analogous to those which have given rise to other devotions tending directly to the Incarnate Word; we fix our attention upon an affection, a friendship, perfectly comprehensible to us because in human form. as on a benefit of uncreated love, a benefit of the same order as other devotions to the Saviour's Humanity but, by reason of its universality, superior to the example, the liberality and the special suffering which we contemplate in them.

#### B. *The Value and Dignity of Christ's Created Love.*

1. *In itself* this love is at the very summit of the created order. No affection is purer in its intention, more constant in its duration, richer in its gifts, more ineffably tender in its effusions; and it is the act of a will so enriched by a plenitude

of graces and gifts as to become their inexhaustible source; finally this love partakes of the substantial holiness of the Word to which it is united.

2. *As Christ's love*, it is of a strictly infinite value. Since this truth includes the mystery of the hypostatic union, I shall not say that it should be better understood, but that it should certainly be more seriously meditated upon. While acknowledging that in Christ the unity of person combines with the duality of natures, we are nevertheless too much inclined to picture to ourselves as something distinct and complete in itself not only the Person of the Word and the Divine Nature with which this Person is identified, but also the Human Nature in which, by a prerogative of Its infinity, the Word has subsisted since the Incarnation. We shall form a better concept, if we ever bear in mind that from the time of the Incarnation the Human Nature is not something exterior to the Person of the Word (1) and a sort of cloak in which it is enveloped: far from reducing itself to a mere juxtaposition, the union of the Word and the Human Nature is just as intimate as the union between a human person and his nature. Now, in the state of union the person and the nature constitute a single subsisting being. The nature receives its completion from the person, independently of which we could not conceive it as existing. How impossible to address the nature without addressing the person! As well honor a thought without the thinking mind. The better to insist upon this idea, (2) though it be far from our purpose here to give the preference to any one philosophical theory, we shall refer to the Thomist doctrine which provides such a just conception of the intimacy of this union. It decomposes every finite being into two principles: one, the essence by which *it is this* rather than that; the other, the existence by which *this is*. These two principles form a single concrete reality. Well then, the

---

(1) Franzelin, *De Verbo incarnato*, p. 466, note.

(2) In representing the person as giving positive completion we have already insinuated the Thomist explanation, having done so merely in order to simplify matters.

Human Nature of the Word is not completed by a created existence; without any change in Itself the Person of the Word supplies this act for the Human Nature of Christ: It is that by which this Nature exists. Under this aspect, the adoration and the dignity of the Word appear as having fallen to the lot of the Human Nature, and the latter could not be the object of special homage proportionate only to its finite essence; the Human Nature is co-adored with the Person of the Word, as a single *theandric reality*. To the question: Is there, in Christ, a complete reality, *purely divine*? we must answer: yes; Is there a *purely human* reality? No; there is a divine reality and a theandric reality. What a marvel of omnipotence and goodness! In the Heart of the Incarnate Word God gives us a *divinified*, deified love.(1)

*C. Why the Special Reason for the Devotion to the Sacred Heart is Furnished by Created, not Uncreated Love.*

1. First motive.—The special reason of this devotion is found in the *living Heart* of the Saviour, considered as the *real symbol* of His love for us.(2) But as the living Heart of the Saviour is the real symbol of His created love it could not therefore be that of His uncreated love. In fact, as we have already shown by arguments based upon reason and authority, the Heart is the real symbol of the love which It renders sensible and of which It feels the slightest repercussion. Now, created love, both sensible and spiritual, and created love only, finds an echo within the Human Heart of the Saviour and is rendered directly sensible by that Heart. Hence, the Sacred Heart is the real, direct symbol of created love only.

Even those who would introduce uncreated love must agree to this. It is in another way that they recognize in the Heart of Christ the symbol of this love. They appeal, for instance, to a sort of anthropomorphism in Holy Scripture which admits of representing by a heart, even the love of God. But

---

(1) Muzzarelli, op. cit., p. 10.

(2) See the proofs furnished in Section IV of this study.



this imaginary symbolism (1) which would hold, whether Our Lord became incarnate or not, has nothing in common with *real* symbolism which makes the Heart of Jesus and His love a *single object of worship*. (2) The Heart of the Divinity exists merely on canvas, as a simple picture worthy of relative honor only. (3)

If they resort rather to the perfect union of the two wills, in virtue of which the Human Will of Christ loves nothing not loved by His Divine Will, they merely succeed in showing that the Heart of Jesus does not directly manifest uncreated love, but only by means of created affection; therefore the latter only constitutes the object directly symbolized.

When, in her account of the revelation, Blessed Margaret Mary represents Christ as saying: "Behold" not only "Him Who loves you," but, "Behold the Heart which has loved men so much," what idea is directly evoked other than that of created love? Is it not indeed the love of a human heart?

Correctly speaking, the complete object of the devotion to the Sacred Heart is therefore the God-Man, loving in His Human Nature in which we know Him to be infinitely amiable for "in the mysteries of the life and Passion of Christ, the God-Man is acting and suffering in His Humanity." (4) And this very analogy confirms the conviction we are endeavoring to establish.

2. Second Motive.—First let us recall with Father Nilles, that the devotion and the feast of the Sacred Heart have one and the same object. The preamble to the decree of concession states that the feast was asked for and granted in order to increase a devotion already established. (5)

According to Benedict XIV, "no feast in honor of Christ

(1) We say *imaginary*, not *metaphorical*: the heart taken as a *symbol* is not a metaphorical heart. Where the term *heart* is substituted for *love*, it is used in a metaphorical sense, but is not taken as a symbol.

(2) Heretofore explained in Section IV.

(3) See, On devotion to the picture, Franzelin, *De Verbo incarnato*, vol. II, p. 458.

(4) Franzelin, *op. cit.*, p. 468.

(5) Nilles, *De Rationibus* . . . , vol. I, p. 224.

refers to the Son as the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity ; these feasts are all feasts of Christ, that is to say, of God made Man, representing the singular graces and profound mysteries which the Incarnate Word has operated for the salvation of mankind.”(1)

Leo XIII, in his Encyclical *Divinum illud* on devotion to the Holy Ghost, formulates these two general propositions: there is no feast in honor of the Word according to its Divine Nature ; the honors of Christ reflect upon the Trinity.

But the love which Jesus Christ bears us in His Divine Nature is a love which He has as Second Person of the Blessed Trinity. Therefore, if this love were directly honored, the Word as Second Person of the Blessed Trinity would be honored, and the honor would not need to reflect upon the Trinity ; it would be given to the Trinity Itself.

Perhaps the exception may be raised, that this worship would not be directed only to the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, but that it would be mixed, divided between the two natures. But it should be observed that the proposition of Benedict XIV is exclusive: to deny that the feasts of Christ are in honor of the Word as Second Person of the Blessed Trinity is also to deny that such feasts could even partially refer to Him. Besides, a mixed or miscellaneous devotion seems to us to present serious inconveniences. Is it not liable to engender confusion? Authors who are admirable in other respects, speak of a love of Christ at once divine and human ; of a love of both natures. Now, according to our way of thinking, it is quite as deplorable to allude to one love in Christ as to one will, notwithstanding the orthodox explanation which these expressions may receive. At last we see of what dissimilar elements our opponents would compose the special object of the devotion. To introduce both uncreated and created love into the devotion to the Sacred Heart, the Heart must be taken first in the proper sense, then figuratively ; or at least two different symbolical significations must

---

(1) *De Beatif. et Canonizatione*, liv. p. 2, XXX, n. 2.

be attached to It. The worship of the Humanity of Christ becomes the worship of the Divine Nature when, from created, we pass to uncreated love. In short, the latter performs the functions of the direct and the final object. This all seems too complicated for the truth, and piety has nothing to gain from explanations(1) which are so involved.

Besides, what of the poor and lowly? Can we forget them when speaking of the Heart of Him whose chosen ones they are? Surely they will not raise the question as to the nature of the love presented to them, whether theandric or divine. In fact the discussion exceeds their comprehension too far to interest them. But will not the solution which the priest holds as true influence the way in which the devotion will be proposed from the pulpit, or in the popular brochures commonly circulated? Do not the discourses heard and the writings perused sometimes leave the impression of an object too indefinitely circumscribed or too complex? But, if we mistake not, the explanation to which we have subscribed frames the devotion to the Sacred Heart in a well-defined concept easily grasped by all. Indeed, all its elements may be included in a short series of questions and answers.—Who is the recipient of our homage in the worship of the Sacred Heart? Jesus Christ.—In what part of His Sacred Body is He especially honored? In His Heart.—Why? Because of the immense love, repaid by ingratitude, which that Heart represents.—What is this love? A love like ours in form, but infinite in value, the most signal proofs of which were the sorrowful Passion and the institution of the Holy Eucharist.—What acts must be offered it? 'Acts of love and atonement and frequent communions of reparation.

Finally let us add in favor of our thesis, that it emphasizes the dignity of the Humanity of the Word and brings into relief the rôle played by that Humanity: a rôle that serves to bring God and man into closer relationship. Those who in this devotion seem to place created and uncreated love on the

---

(1) Like Muzzarelli's.



same footing promote the interests of neither one nor the other. Created love risks being eclipsed by uncreated love; the latter in its turn is masked by created love which, in their explanations, these devotees must constantly recall, even to the point of seeming to forget the love which, in essence, is infinite.

At the time of writing our dissertation it was our good fortune to meet in the *Messenger du Sacré-Cœur* (1868, p. 275, etc.) an article that permits us to identify our opinion with that of Père H. Ramière. Here is his formal testimony: "Although the eternal and divine love with which Our Lord Jesus Christ is inflamed is in no way foreign to the devotion to His loving Heart, *the proper object of this devotion is His human and created love.*" Then follow the reasons developed to the end of the article.

D. *How, in a Broad Sense, Uncreated Love may Become the Special Object of the Devotion to the Sacred Heart.*

Some great authors without putting the two loves on the same level grant that, *in a broad sense*, the Heart of Jesus symbolizes both created and uncreated love. Such is the opinion of Marquès, Father Nilles, Father de San and Father Nix. To the decree of 1765 heretofore explained, which constitutes their principal argument, they add the following theological reason: The perfect agreement of the two wills in Christ makes us see in created love the inspiration of uncreated love; therefore the Heart that symbolizes the first comes to symbolize the second.

Let us set this conclusion aside for a moment; their reasoning fails to attain its end. It does not tally with the decree of the Sacred Congregation which they endeavor not to contradict. In fact this decree speaks of the love which led the Son of God to become man. If, to follow them, we must understand this love to be uncreated love, it historically and logically preceded the formation of the Heart of Jesus and the transports of created love. Hence it has no connection whatever with a created love non-existent at the time, and

the agreement of the two wills in Christ does not explain the symbol.

Moreover, this reasoning would propose as the material object the divine love guiding and inspiring the Saviour in His Human Nature. But neither the Roman Congregation nor the Gospel speaks thus. The divine will to which Christ conforms His human will is referred by Him to His Father. "I do always the things that please him. : . . Not my will, but thine, be done." (1) The divine love that guides the Saviour is attributed to the Holy Ghost. It was under the influence of the Holy Ghost that Jesus went into the desert; it was by virtue of the Holy Ghost that He expelled demons and the Evangelist recalls the prophetic announcement, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me." (2)

And to show in a word the deficiency of the reasoning itself, does it follow that because the created love of Christ manifests an uncreated love, the latter is any other than the *final object* of the devotion, such as we have explained it? (3) It is true that the flame of Jesus' love rises heavenward and causes us to acknowledge and bless an eternal and infinite love; but we must not confound the object which we honor with the ultimate end toward which our homage should be directed.

What, however, is to be thought of that symbolism which, according to these authors, applies by extension to uncreated love, because of the perfect agreement of the divine will with the human will of Christ?

Frankly, we do not favor it. Besides, is it sufficient that two wills be united upon the same object in order that the symbol of the one be that of the other? Were the wills of a like nature we would say yes; but when they are separated by the wide differences distinguishing the uncreated from the created, the eternal and immutable from that which is temporal and successive, is it appropriate, is it even possible to give them the same symbolical representation? Assuredly

(1) Jn. VIII, 29. St. Luke XXII, 42; and elsewhere in St. John.

(2) Matt. IV, 1; Luke XI, 20; IV, 18.

(3) See first point in this subdivision: paragraph A.

by a sort of anthropomorphism, of which we have already spoken, the heart of the imaginary body with which we invest God, would be the *imaginary* symbol of divine love. But in this symbolism, which follows a first reduction of the Divinity to the proportions of man, no one is mistaken either as to the meaning or the deficient character of the representation. On the contrary, to our mind, the Heart of Our Lord is too really the symbol of the theandric affections to stand at the same time for an imaginary symbol of the purely divine affections, even though these should be fixed upon the same objects.

However, we refrain from openly contradicting the authors who admit that, in a broad sense, the Heart of Christ can symbolize uncreated love. Their conclusion can be accepted on one condition only, which is that the love in question may be called the love of Christ, as proper to Christ or attributed to Him. In imposing this condition we are following the doctrine so forcibly inculcated by Leo XIII in his Encyclical on the Holy Ghost: no divine person is given special honor except that provoked by an exterior mission either *proper to* or *attributed* to that person.

The mission which the Word accomplishes in His Humanity is *proper to Him*, and His Heart symbolizes the created love with which It has real affinities. In a wider sense the Heart may also symbolize an uncreated love which, *in consequence of attribution*, is assimilated to the first. Is there one? St. Thomas replies affirmatively. Although the Incarnation of the Son of God was decided upon and brought about by the entire Blessed Trinity, according to the rules of appropriation set forth by the sainted Doctor, the Father is supposed to have given the order which the Son is reputed to have executed in assuming human nature; that is to say, in taking not only a soul but a body, the forming of which is attributed to the Holy Ghost. Hence we can speak of a love that moved the Father to give or to send His Son (1) and of a love which prompted this Son to take upon Himself human na-

---

(1) John, III, 16.



ture.(1) It is this uncreated love of which the decree of 1765 speaks, if indeed, uncreated love is to be therein understood. The Heart of Christ symbolizes uncreated love for another reason than that which makes it symbolize created love. It is the symbol of the latter because of a real correspondence with the affections of human nature, whereas it is the symbol of the uncreated love appropriated to Christ, only by virtue of an imaginary representation which gives a human form to the Divine Person Itself.

*E. Conclusions and Corollaries.*

We must decidedly exclude from the Devotion to the Sacred Heart uncreated love as manifested in the creation and in the Old Testament. These amplifications deprive the devotion of its special character and proper influence; they cause it to lose itself in ambiguity.

The revelations of Blessed Margaret Mary do not speak of *Our Lord's love for His Father*. In the documents of the Holy See the only allusion to it is that discreetly made by the bishops of Poland. Hence we shall not consider this love the direct object of the Devotion to the Sacred Heart. Jesus wishes to touch us by the love He bears us! But in responding to the advances of Our Sweet Saviour, in accomplishing His desires, we should pledge ourselves to imitate His virtues and among these there shines forth with singular brilliancy His love for His Father, which was the principle virtue of His Heart. Did He not say: "That the world may know that I love the Father!"(2) Why then should not the friends of His Heart take heed of this?

In giving us the devotion to His Sacred Heart Our Lord's love exhausted itself in its effort thus to bless the Christians of these later centuries.(3) Hence we shall not try to assign any more remote date to this cherished form of worship and by so doing overlook the dominant characteristics of the de-

---

(1) St. Thomas, *Summa Theologica*, part III, q. XXXII, a. 1, ad 1.

(2) John, XIV, 33.

(3) *Vie et Oeuvres de la bienheureuse Marguerite-Marie Alacoque*, t. II, p. 275.

votion as we practice it to-day, only to confound it with the enthusiastic homage formerly paid to the love or to the Heart of Jesus by certain saints. To be sure the foundation of the devotion was revealed with Christianity, and we may say that ever since the Last Supper it has had reason to exist. From that time when the excessive love of Our Lord led Him to give Himself up to death for us and to institute the Blessed Eucharist, has not that love been subjected to the grossest neglect and blackest ingratitude? But it remained as if hidden in the Bosom of God till the moment when Jesus, through the voice of a humble religious, proposed "to Christians an object and a means so well qualified to engage their love." (1)

2. When speaking or writing let us not hesitate to bring Jesus Christ and His love close to the people as, by so doing, we shall be entering into the very designs of Our Lord Himself Who wished to draw us to His Heart, so as to render us more sensible to the delicacy and immensity of His love. Let us then put clearly before the eyes of the faithful a Heart that really beats and experiences emotions similar to those which they themselves feel in their best moments; a Heart that, if it can no longer suffer, can nevertheless be truly comforted by them and take delight in their affections; (2) a Heart more sensible than any other heart to the influence of all the sentiments of the soul; a Heart that loves them to excess with a love of the same form as that which they may offer in return. When identified with the Divine Nature, love is too far beyond all conception to easily move us. Human in form, divine in the person possessing it, it is worthy of all homage and most capable of touching us. The love of the Heart of Jesus, like Jesus Christ Himself, is the excellent, the indispensable way, human and yet divine, which leads us up to the Father, that is to say, to the Adorable Trinity. We honor the living Heart of Jesus to find therein the theandric

(1) *Vie et Oeuvres* . . . , t. II, p. 275.

(2) In writing these lines we recall the impression which this simple remark made upon a priest exercising the sacred ministry: "We can really give joy to Our Lord! What a discovery! What advantages I hope to reap from it! What a resource for touching hearts!"

love which it symbolizes and by means of which we may be elevated even to uncreated love, of which this theandric love itself is a supreme gift.

3. A way different from that followed by Father Billot, brings us, however, to the formula of the professor in the Roman College: "In the Incarnate Word, the Heart is the symbol of uncreated love which caused the Word to descend upon earth and of created love which manifested itself from the first instant and led Him even unto the cross. . . . The contemplation of the Sacred Heart recalls to us all the principles of our salvation." (1)

But such is the object of the devotion *in its broadest conception*. The revelations of the Blessed One, the authority of the first promoters and of many theologians, the lessons of the Breviary and theological reasoning confine within narrower limits *the proper and precise idea of the devotion*. If, as we have said and repeated, its *complete* object is the God-Man loving us in His Human Nature, *the special object of the devotion is the Heart of Christ with the created love which It symbolizes*: this love which spent itself in the sacrifice of the cross and of the altar. The love symbolized demonstrates in its turn an uncreated love common to the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, to Whom by the worship of the Sacred Heart we finally give homage.

Sublime indeed are such proofs of love as the cross and the Eucharist, but still more sublime is the love which inspires them. And when this love is conceived in the human way and, on the other hand, *divinified* by the person possessing it, these created inspirations of a God draw us irresistibly to God and to His infinite love. The Heart of Christ is the supreme pledge of the eternal love of God. Such is the devotion to the Sacred Heart. St. Paul gave its formula when he said: "*Dilexit me et tradidit semetipsum pro me*. He loved me and delivered Himself for me." (2) It is to this love that

---

(1) *De Verbo incarnato*, p. 332.

(2) *Gal.*, II, 20.



the devotion to the Sacred Heart calls our attention and our gratitude.

Gratitude! Alas, what a sad spectacle of ingratitude do we not behold! The call to love becomes the call to reparation. This last feature completes the devotion to the Sacred Heart, and Mgr. d'Hulst has well defined it as the *perpetuity of the Holy Hour*.(1)

4. The custom has prevailed of *addressing one's self to the Heart of Jesus* as to His Person Itself. A legitimate custom, said the bishops of Poland in their *Memorial*,(2) because all that terminates in the heart terminates in the person.

However, it is important thoroughly to understand this mode of expression. Invocations addressed to the Heart of Jesus should be understood as if it were said: *Jesus, Who hast a Heart*, and this Heart should be taken in its proper sense as the real Heart which at the same time is the symbol of love.

But since the Heart, properly speaking, symbolizes only created love, all the qualities attributed to the Heart should, in so far as possible, be understood as belonging to the Saviour's Human Nature. Thus by *infinity* will be meant infiniteness of dignity;(3) omnipotence, the power that is Christ's by virtue of His Passion and death: "All power is given to me in heaven and on earth."(4) There is no invocation in any of the approved litanies, no versicle or prayer in the Little Office(5) that calls for another interpretation.

However, the person invoked combines all the attributes of the Divinity and the Humanity. Invocations such as this: *Heart of Jesus, save me*; correspond perfectly to: *Jesus, by Thy Sacred Heart, by Its tenderness, save me!* By using similar expressions we draw from Christ's Human Nature,

(1) *Lettres de direction*, 2, p. 74, Lettre L.

(2) Nilles, *De Rationibus* . . . , 4, p. 117, n. 33.

(3) Muzzarelli, *op. cit.*, p. 16. The same author does not so well interpret the expression "All-powerful Heart."

(4) Matthew, XXVIII, 18.

(5) A stanza in Lauds of the Divine Office recalls, as we have already seen, the love as the cause of the Incarnation. See paragraph 4, note 1, of this study.

from His Heart, from some one of Its qualities, a reason which entitles us to the intervention of the Divine Person and of its divinity itself. It follows that, if the Heart or the quality attributed to It must be akin to the Human Nature, always united to the Divine Person, the action solicited requires, in fact, always will require, the intervention of the Divinity. Although Our Lord intercedes for us in His Humanity, we do not beg Him in the *vocative* to pray for us.(1) The *save us* of the invocation heretofore quoted is therefore not identical with the similarly worded appeal to the Blessed Virgin nor indeed with that of the formula *Heart of Jesus, salvation of sinners*; but it is the *save us* addressed to the Divinity.

## CHAPTER VI.

### DEVOTION TO THE BLESSED SACRAMENT COMPARED WITH THE DEVOTION TO THE SACRED HEART.

Our plan calls for a brief sketch of the Devotion to the Blessed Sacrament which *directly* honors the Body of Jesus Christ, as is testified by the name of the feast: *The Solemnity of the Body of the Lord*. In the Blessed Eucharist the Body only is present in virtue of the words of consecration; the Soul and Divinity are there by concomitance and as inseparable from the Saviour's glorious Body.

Thanks to this Sacrament Jesus is *present* amongst us; *He immolates Himself* for us and His Body becomes the spiritual nourishment of our souls, the pledge of our immortality. This triple blessing, the *presence*, the *immolation* and the *giving in nourishment*, constitutes the special reason for the honor we give to Christ.

To these motives, drawn directly from the consideration of an infinite munificence, may be added those suggested by the sight of our ingratitude toward the Author of these super-eminent benefits.

---

(1) However, we ask Him to present His Wounds to His Father; we have recourse to His meditation with the Divinity. We always pray through Christ.

If we compare this devotion with the devotion to the Sacred Heart, we find that, on the one hand, the devotion to the Blessed Sacrament honors the entire Body, while the devotion to the Sacred Heart honors but a part. On the other hand, the Real Presence, the immolation and the giving in nourishment, commemorated in the worship of the Blessed Sacrament, constitute together one of the two great benefits which the devotion to the Sacred Heart refers to the love of Jesus Christ. Even the other benefit, the Passion, is not foreign to the devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, as this Sacrament is the memorial of the Saviour's Passion; the very time of its institution recalls the Passion; it is completed during the course of the sacrifice, which is a continuation of that on Calvary; it was symbolized by the Precious Blood that flowed from Our Lord's open Side; and the mystical separation on our altars, of the Body and Blood of the Saviour, represents the Passion and death of Christ.

Hence it is easy to understand why there should have been such conflicting views as to whether the object of both devotions was sufficiently distinct to warrant the simultaneous commemoration of one and the other in the Office and the Mass. The negative solution of the question prevailed. According to the opinion of the Sacred Congregation of Rites we not only honor the same Person in the Blessed Sacrament and in the Sacred Heart, but even commemorate the same mystery. It is for this reason that all commemoration of the Blessed Sacrament is excluded from the Mass of the Sacred Heart and *vice versa*.(1)

Should it be asked why, on the eve of the Feast of the Sacred Heart, the Vespers are those of the octave of the Blessed Sacrament rather than of the feast of the morrow, the two following reasons reproduced in the latest edition of the decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites(2) may be given: the Feast of the Blessed Sacrament is primary and

---

(1) *Collectio Decretorum authenticorum*, n. 3924, Decree of July 3, 1896, ad IV.

(2) Vol. IV, pp. 248-249.



privileged, whereas the Feast of the Sacred Heart is a secondary feast of Our Lord; moreover, "although the object of both feasts be the same,(1) one feast presents us with the reality of which the other offers us the symbol."

Besides, from the very beginning, the Feast of the Sacred Heart has been looked upon as a prolongation of the Feast of Corpus Christi, its date being purposely placed after the octave of this solemnity in order to call our attention to the insults suffered by Our Lord in the Sacrament of His love. The Feast of the Sacred Heart is invested with an expiatory character which makes it in a special way a public reparation for the carelessness and indifference manifested during the solemnity of Corpus Christi.

## CHAPTER VII.

### DEVOTION TO THE HOLY GHOST COMPARED WITH THE DEVOTION TO THE SACRED HEART OF JESUS.

Another sublime devotion, likewise inspired by divine love, is that to the Holy Ghost, and we shall endeavor to give in a few words a clear idea of it.

The mission of the Word to mankind occasioned the special devotion to Jesus Christ, and the mission of the Holy Ghost to mankind gave rise to the devotion to the Holy Ghost. There is, however, this notable difference. Jesus Christ is lovable and adorable in a humanity which is truly His, hypostatically united to His person; the Holy Ghost is lovable and adorable in benefits exterior to His Person, common to all Three Divine Persons and simply attributed to the Third. In the devotion to the Holy Ghost the Third Person of the

---

(1) Is it a mistake to see the ideas stated in the course of this work confirmed by this direction which contradicts several authors and preceding opinions? In thus treating the question of commemorations the Congregation of Rites holds to the object of the Feast as it is described in Lesson VI of the Office; and we were right in seeking there, above all, the actual opinion of the Holy See. It is on condition of seeing in the devotion to the Sacred Heart the devotion to the love of Christ suffering and instituting the Blessed Eucharist in memory even of His death, that one may consider, as it were, identical in object the feast of the real Heart, the symbol of that love, and the Feast of the Sacrament which is the memorial of the Passion.

Blessed Trinity is directly honored just as the Person of the Word directly receives the honor called forth by the devotion to the Sacred Heart: in both cases the entire Blessed Trinity is honored indirectly. But in the devotion to the Holy Ghost the honor does not attain a nature or a quality proper to the Holy Ghost, as in the devotion to the Sacred Heart the homage is paid to the Heart and the love proper to the Incarnate Word as well as to the Person. All the benefits of divine love, that is, all divine benefits, the creation, the supernatural vocation, the sanctification, even the Incarnation, are the reason for the existence of this devotion to the Holy Ghost, as the loving action and Passion of the Incarnate Word are the motive of the worship of the Sacred Heart; but we are considering above all that mission of the Holy Ghost which completes and crowns the mission of the Incarnate Word, in granting us either through an immediate interior operation or the channel of the sacraments, the grace and the glory merited by Jesus Christ; and also in the devotion to the Sacred Heart, although we commemorate the whole Redemption, the Incarnate Word entire, we especially honor the Passion and Eucharist.

Not only is the Holy Ghost one with the Father and the Son, but He proceeds from the Father and the Son; therefore we can readily understand how the worship and the glory given to the Holy Ghost are at the same time given to the Father, to the Son and to the Holy Ghost. If it is in accordance with our nature to attribute divine love and its works to one Person, this in no wise diverts our homage from the end toward which it should tend, which is the entire Divinity, the principle and end of all things.

## APPENDIX.

### 1. *Devotion to the Eucharistic Heart of Jesus.*

The expression *Eucharistic Heart of Jesus* taken alone, may signify *Heart of Jesus to which we owe the Eucharist*, just as "Agonizing Heart of Jesus" means the Heart I consider at this moment in Its loving Passion, or else "*Heart of Jesus present in the Blessed Eucharist.*"

It is this second acceptation that is adopted in the recently approved devotion of the *Eucharistic Heart of Jesus*. To be convinced of this it will only be necessary to read over the indulgenced prayers, particularly this invocation: "Praised, adored, loved and thanked be at all times the Eucharistic Heart of Jesus, in all the tabernacles of the world, unto the end of time!" (100 days' indulgence once a day.) It is nevertheless clear that in considering the Eucharistic Saviour our attention will be especially drawn to the benefit of His Presence in the Blessed Sacrament.

This expression Eucharistic Heart is evidently adapted to rhetorical development, which will be more or less correct and successful according to the talent and learning of the author.

But, in reality, since there is only one Heart of Jesus, glorious in Heaven, glorious, though hidden, in the tabernacle (since, in the tabernacle, the Heart has neither sentiment nor action proper to the Eucharistic state) this devotion does not



effectively differ from the devotion to the Sacred Heart.(1) It seeks the Heart where it really is, in the Holy Eucharist, by directing our attention in a particular manner to the immense benefit of the permanent gift of Himself thus made us by Jesus Christ.

It was in the tabernacle that Blessed Margaret Mary delighted to adore the Divine Heart, and indeed many writers think that the worship of the Eucharistic Sacred Heart was the same that she sought to propagate.(2)

## 2. *The Practice of the Devotion to the Sacred Heart.*

According to Père de Gallifet's beautiful formula the devotion should respond in full to the *dignity, love and affliction* of the Heart of Jesus.

The *principal end* of the devotion is to "repair by love and adoration and all kinds of homage the many insults to which the excess of His love exposes Jesus Christ at all times in this august Sacrament." (3) In expressing himself on the subject Père Croiset simply repeats the words placed by Blessed Margaret Mary in the mouth of Our Lord Himself. Père de Gallifet uses the same language(4) and the *Memorial* offered under Benedict XIV to the Sacred Congregation of Rites is based on his authority. This purpose of reparation is also inculcated in the Office of Blessed Margaret Mary (Lesson V): "While she was praying before the Blessed Sacrament, Our Lord showed her through the opening in His side, His Heart surrounded by flames and encircled with thorns; and He bade her devote herself to obtaining that, in

---

(1) "The worship of the Eucharistic Heart of Jesus is not more perfect than the worship of the Eucharist Itself and does not differ from the worship of the Sacred Heart of Jesus." (Decree of the Holy Office, June 3, 1891.) And the *Raccolta* of Indulgences (edition of 1898), before giving the acts of homage to the Eucharistic Heart, remarks that "the devotion to the Eucharistic Heart of Jesus should not be understood as differing in substance from that which the Church already professes toward this same Heart."

(2) See Blot's *le Cœur Eucharistique*, t. I, n. 47.

(3) *La Dévotion au Sacré Cœur*, part I, chapt. 3, to the end.

(4) *De cultu* . . . , liv. III, chapt. 3.

return for such love and in reparation for the insults suffered from the ingratitude of men, His Heart would receive public worship of which magnificent favors would be the reward."

Here, as always, Our Lord was eager to turn even our most generous acts to our supreme advantage. Final salvation and abundance of all spiritual favors are promised to those who honor the Heart of Jesus and endeavor to make It known and loved. Therefore the worship has a *secondary* end, a *spiritual enrichment* by which we ourselves will be the first to profit and the sweet influence of which will be felt all around us.

3. *Acts of devotion.* Here there is question of private devotion only, which would not be real did it not join to exterior acts the interior acts which are its very soul. Several authors have carefully traced quite a complete programme of the acts sanctioned by the devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus. From the beginning of the devotion Père Jean Croiset dedicates the greater part of his work to the means of acquiring the devotion and to practical exercises. The third book of Père de Gallifet's celebrated treatise is entitled: *De usu et praxi Cultus S. Cordis Jesu*, and still later Father de Franciosi, in his beautiful book *La Dévotion au Sacré Cœur de Jesus et au saint Cœur de Marie*, also insists upon the practice of the devotion and the means of acquiring it; and Father Bucceroni's work, *Commentarii in cultum SS. Cordis Jesu*, contains a close analysis of the homage belonging to the devotion to the Sacred Heart.

As to what concerns the *interior acts* we deem it well to reproduce two of Father de Gallifet's pages (Book III, Chap. I).

"The interior worship of the Heart of Jesus consists, for the *mind*, in fathoming the excellence of the Divine Heart, that is, Its dignity, sanctity, sublimity; the treasures of grace

hidden within It; all that It has endured for the glory of God and the salvation of men; how pleasing and precious It is to the Most Holy Trinity; the attractions It possesses for all the faithful; briefly, in learning how much this Heart deserves our love and our sovereign respect. These considerations should excite within us an infinite esteem for this Holy Heart. Such is the first foundation of the entire worship.

The first care of lovers of the Heart of Jesus should therefore be to acquire this knowledge, to apply their mind to its contemplation and to searching its depths. For this purpose reading alone will not suffice; there must be meditation, better still, prayer, and even the practice of the devotion.

Having thus trained the mind they will have but little trouble in controlling the acts of the *will*, we mean to say the affections that respond to the infinite excellence of the Heart of Jesus. Supreme adoration is due to Its supreme dignity. Its sovereign prerogatives and perfections are entitled to admiration, glorification and praise: Its immense love merits a reciprocal love; the benefits of which It is for us the source claim a suitable thanksgiving; Its mercy invites confidence; the virtues of which It is the seat call for imitation; the insults which wound Its honor demand reparation; and so on with the rest.

And since nothing is dearer to the Heavenly Father than this Divine Heart, we avail ourselves of Its nearness to Him in order to render our actions and sufferings acceptable and agreeable to the Divine Majesty, by uniting them all to the actions and sufferings of this Most Holy Heart. Through the Heart of Jesus we adore God, we praise Him, love Him, implore favors of Him, give Him thanks, resign ourselves to the Divine Will, ask pardon of our faults and so on. Finally, and this practice, as it were, characterizes the devotion, we compare the immense love with which the Heart of Jesus burns for men with the insults which they in their ingratitude



heap upon It and, knowing ourselves to be among the number of ingrates, covered with confusion and penetrated with sorrow, we humbly entreat Its pardon and, prostrate before It, offer from the bottom of our hearts and to the best of our power, the atonement It so justly claims. This kind of homage, as the nature of the devotion obviously proves, substantiates the most ardent desires of the Heart of Jesus.

The help of the memory and the frequent and familiar appeals of this Divine Heart enable us to multiply beyond reckoning the acts or exercises peculiar to the interior worship and, while contributing to its entire perfection, necessarily lead us to the exterior worship.

We shall limit ourselves to mentioning the principal acts of *exterior worship: the celebration of the Feast of the Sacred Heart and of the First Friday*, especially by the visit, the *amende honorable*, the consecration, and the communion of reparation; (1) *the weekly observance of Friday* by meditation and the practice of the Holy Hour; *the daily devotion of oblation and prayer; the exposing of the picture of the Sacred Heart; frequent and fervent communion*: it is the last that brings us heart to heart with Our Lord. And here we must not forget to mention imitation, (2) so dear to the Heart of

---

(1) We know the great promise attached to the communion of the nine First Fridays. See our commentary published in *Études*, 1903, vol. XCV, p. 593, or our brochure: *la Grande Promesse*, Paris, Retaux.

(2) *The imitation of the virtues* of Our Lord is an excellent form with which to clothe reparative love. And the qualities of Our Lord's Heart, especially its meekness and humility, should be proposed as examples. Does St. Paul not emphatically teach this in the passage already quoted from his Epistle to the Philippians (II, 5)? Thus conceived, the devotion to the Sacred Heart contains nothing that is not legitimate and salutary; and it is presented under this aspect in the Decree of 1766 and the prayer of the Office approved for Venice. However, this concept is not that bequeathed to us in the revelations of Blessed Margaret Mary. Imitation is not excluded from it, but neither is it indicated; it is a concrete way of loving and atoning.

Jesus, because it turns to practical account His Passion, death and the Eucharist and brings us ever closer to Him; and finally the *Apostleship* which, by making them fruitful, crowns both virtue and love.

All these acts are acts of devotion to the Sacred Heart, above all when we perform them out of love and reparation, the two great duties of him who loves the Heart of Jesus. And further to stimulate our ardor let us consider that if the sorrows of the Heart of Jesus necessarily belong to the past, the Saviour can even now feel in His Heart the sweet joy which a faithful, generous friendship insures to men.

Let us close this paragraph by quoting a few lines from the portrait drawn by Père Croiset(1) of the man who loves Jesus Christ perfectly. "The man who loves Jesus Christ perfectly is a man without self-love, without dissimulation, without ambition; a man strict with himself at all times and never excusing himself, yet extremely lenient with others, in whose favor he excuses everything. Honest but not affected, complacent but not cowardly, obliging but not self-interested, extremely exact but not scrupulous, constantly united to God but not vehement, never idle yet not seeming over assiduous, never too much absorbed in nor yet distracted by his occupations, he always keeps his heart untrammelled, occupying it solely with the great affair of his salvation. He has but a humble opinion of himself because conscious only of his defects, whereas he esteems others on account of seeing naught but their virtues."

"Increase," the Apostle St. Peter exhorts us(2) "in grace and in the knowledge of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To him be glory both now and in the day of eternity. Amen."

A. VERMEERSCH.

---

(1) *La Dévotion au Sacré Cœur*, part III, chap. 8, paragraph 1.

(2) II Peter, III, 18.